The Outlook

DECEMBER 7, 1912

LYMAN ABBOTT, Editor-in-Chief HAMILTON W. MABIE, Associate Editor
THEODORE ROOSEVELT
Contributing Editor

The Salem Trial of the Lawrence Case

When an American court, an American jury, and American legal methods can stand such a test as that to which they were subjected in the trial of Ettor, Giovannitti, and Caruso, they must be established on a fairly firm basis. Our courts are far from perfect, our juries are human like the rest of us, and our legal methods sometimes seem designed to thwart as well as to promote justice and fair play; but they are, we believe, essentially sound. It is an occasion for thankfulness on the part of every decent, law-abiding American when our court methods for obtaining justice do withstand any severe shock. In the case of Ettor, Giovannitti, and Caruso it was not merely the defendants who were on trial. The question was not merely whether these three men were guilty of murder, but also whether an American court could discriminate between charges against men as murderers and opposition to men as agitators of an undesirable propaganda. The acquittal of these three men proves that that court could see and enforce the distinction. The events of the Lawrence strike, which began in January of this year and lasted for several weeks, are still fresh in the minds of the people. During that strike a woman was killed. It was charged that the killing was the consequence of a riot, and that those who were engaged in the riot had been wrought up to their pitch of excitement by the speeches of two leaders in this strike, Joseph J. Ettor and Arturo Giovannitti. Passions were inflamed on both sides. How deep the feeling ran and still runs regarding this strike The Outlook has evidence in the form of numerous letters from its readers. The struggle was one of those in which each side is convinced that those who are not actively for them are against them. On the one hand, the opponents of the strikers regard Ettor and Giovannitti as intruders, who came bringing disorder, anarchy, and hatred; they consider that the inevitable consequences of their activity must be revolution and death; and that they must be held responsible for such inevitable consequences. When, therefore, a homicide occurred, those who felt this animosity toward the leaders of the strike declared that these leaders should be held directly accountable as murderers in the eyes of the law. On the other hand, the sympathizers with the strikers, who were for the most part poor people unaccustomed to the English tongue or to American institutions, regarded their fight as a struggle on behalf of justice and human rights, and looked upon the opponents as the selfish and heartless apologists of a selfish and heartless capitalistic system. With such feelings on both sides, Ettor and Giovannitti were arrested as murderers on the ground that their words had brought the murder about, and Joseph Caruso as one of the actual perpetrators of the deed. For months these men lay in jail. The case came to trial in October. The case for the prosecution may be fairly said to rest upon the assumption that the sort of economic doctrine which Ettor and Giovannitti held and preached was of itself an incitement to murder. After the testimony and arguments of counsel were all in, the judge charged the jury that neither Ettor nor Giovannitti could be adjudged guilty of murder in the first degree, though it would not be contrary to the law to convict them of murder in the second degree. Each of these two prisoners, instead of counsel as usual, made his own final plea to the jury. The jury was not long in deliberation, and promptly brought in a verdict of acquittal. To regard this acquittal as in any wise an approval of the doctrines that these men preached would be as irrational and unintelligent as would have been a conviction of these men on the ground simply that they held such doctrines. If the American people believe that the economic theories propounded by the Industrial Workers of the World and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their leaders such as Ettor and Giovannitti are contrary to public policy and welfare, the way to combat such theories is not to put the preachers of the theories into jail, but to show that other theories more in harmony with American institutions will in practice result in real justice in industrial and social conditions.

Arbitration and the Panama Canal

At a recent dinner of the New York Chamber of Commerce Senator Root made a very strong plea for submitting to arbitration the differences between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States regarding the administration of the Panama Canal. To be exact, Senator Root takes the ground that there are not differences to be adjusted, but that there is only one difference. Under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty the United States agreed, according to Senator Root, to treat the vessels of all nations, including her own vessels, on equal terms in the matter of Canal tolls. It is apparently his view that the terms of the treaty in this respect are not debatable, although, in our judgment, there is some reasonable ground for asking whether, in framing the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, the United States deliberately intended to waive in this wholesale fashion her authority to administer the Canal for her own necessary self-protection with due regard to the just rights of the rest of the world. But, assuming for the moment that Senator Root is correct in his assumption that the general terms of the treaty are not debatable, there remains the question which he recommends for arbitration, namely, whether the exemption of American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls is a violation of the general terms of the treaty as Great Britain and Senator Root interpret it. Of this particular question Senator Root said in his speech:

> I say to you, if we refuse to arbitrate it, we shall be in the position of the merchant who is known to all the world to be false to his promises.

As our readers know, The Outlook does not believe that the exemption of American coastwise vessels—that is to say, vessels engaged solely in the transportation of American merchandise from one recognized United States port to another United States port—is, in any sense of the word, a discrimination against foreign nations. If there is anything in the Panama Act of the nature of a loophole or evasion which permits, by hook or by crook, American *foreign* commerce to take advantage of this provision for its *domestic* commerce, the Panama Act should be at once amended to correct a secret abuse of this kind. We have more than once said in these pages that we should like to see submitted to arbitration the question whether our coastwise navigation laws are incompatible with the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. But we cannot go as far as Senator Root in believing that hesitation regarding such arbitration springs from the same motive that makes a dishonest merchant "false to his promises." There are some practical difficulties in the way of a just and impartial arbitration of this question which, so far as we know, have never come up before in the history of international disputes. This is not a question which involves the interest of the United States and Great Britain alone. The interest of all the great maritime powers of the world are involved. Can arbitral judges be selected who are not really parties at interest? It has been suggested that the court might be constituted of South American jurists. But what states have a greater stake in the issue than those which lie along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of South America? Switzerland is perhaps the only country capable of furnishing international jurists of high standing who would probably be free from all pressure of selfish public opinion when acting as judges of the case. We wish that Senator Root, for whose authority as an international jurist this country has the greatest respect, would indicate how the arbitration court which he recommends could be constituted with justice to all the interests concerned.

The Coal Question

An investigation has been made by the Merchants' Association of New York City into the advances in price for anthracite and into the statements as to the alleged shortage of the coal supply and the danger of still further increased prices. The results of this inquiry seem to sustain certain statements of those in control of the output of coal, who may be for purposes of convenience here termed the Coal Trust, but these statements of the Coal Trust do not by any means cover the basic questions relating to production, carrying, and distribution of anthracite. The Merchants' Association, through its committee, finds that the immediate recent advances in the retail price have been due to the independent coal dealers rather than to those retail dealers who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are under control of the Trust. When it is remembered that the great bulk of the trade is controlled by the Trust, and that the independent producers and dealers control only about fifteen per cent of the total trade, the reason for the fact stated by the committee of the Merchants' Association is at once evident. There are two kinds of advanced prices now paid by consumers: one (which is paid by all consumers) is the advance made by the Coal Trust over the prices of last year; the retailers under the control of the Trust have adhered, it appears, closely to these advanced prices as fixed by the Trust; the second advance has been made by the independent dealers because the retailers under the control of the Coal Trust have not been able to supply coal as fast as it was needed, and buyers who must have coal immediately have been obliged to get it wherever they could, and in many cases from independent dealers at advanced prices. The first advance of which we speak was made by the Coal Trust on the ground of the additional cost to it caused by the breaking off of work while the new contract between the coal companies and the unions was being considered; to the same cause is attributed the temporary shortage of coal. But this matter also will bear a little further examination. It is alleged, and apparently on official statistics, that in point of fact the loss to the Coal Trust from these causes was about six and a half million dollars; while it is pointed out, on the other hand, that the increase in price of twenty-five cents per ton must have given the Trust some fifteen million dollars of profit—an excess of eight and one-half millions over its loss. It is furthermore asserted that improved methods of production and the use of small sizes of coal formerly discarded have made the profits of the Coal Trust larger and not smaller in recent years, and that the consumer of coal has not only reaped no benefit from these things, but has had to bear the burden of increased prices.

The Coal Monopoly

The whole coal problem, thus brought into prominence by the recent events, is a deep-seated question of monopoly, combination, and price-control—a question of precisely the sort that calls for full investigation and action by the Inter-State Commerce Commission, and one that in some of its aspects should certainly be looked into by such a Commerce Board dealing with other than railway interests, as was urged and promised by the National platform of the Progressive party. It has long been known that the anthracite mining companies and the railways which carry this coal are under the same control and practically under the same ownership, so that it has been possible for these owners to fight off claims for fair pay by the miners on the ground that the coal-producing companies are not paying large dividends; to get their own large profits from the coal-carrying business; and at the same time to assert that the coal-carrying railways are not making excessive profits because those profits are needed in order to pay the established dividend on an enormous capitalization which does not represent investment. Now it is further alleged that the Coal Trust controls not only the production of coal and its carriage, but also its distribution. In a hearing which has been going on before the Pennsylvania State Railway Commission the admission was wrung reluctantly from numerous Philadelphia retail coal dealers that they held the leases for their coal-yards from the coal-carrying railways, and that in some cases the railways even owned the machinery in the yards for handling the coal. It seems to have been established that the majority of the coal-yards in Philadelphia were thus ultimately owned by the Coal Trust. This is a branch of investigation which ought to be pushed to a conclusion in New York City and in other large places. If it appears that every branch of the coal industry is under the control of the Trust, while the consumers (which means everybody who uses anthracite) are paying exorbitant prices, the need for drastic action is instant.

The Balkan War: The Allies

Last week saw little fighting in the Bulgarian advance on Constantinople. For this there were two reasons. The first was the resumption of discussions between envoys from Turkey and Bulgaria concerning an armistice and peace terms. The second was the cholera, which, despite the Red Cross camps, is making dreadful ravages among the troops. At Adrianople the lines of investment drawn by the Bulgarian troops are being tightened day by day, the attackers' trenches being now only about a thousand yards from the city itself; the foreign consuls have hoisted flags over their offices so as to prevent the Bulgarians from firing shells in their direction.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is reported that the Turkish garrison has been reduced by losses through the desperate sorties and by deaths from diseases to less than half of its strength at the beginning of the siege. Part of the Greek army has now gone eastward from Salonika to the region where last week the Bulgarians captured a great number of Turkish reserves. Meanwhile the Greek navy has taken another of the islands in the Ægean Sea—Chios this time, one of the richest of them. The capture may mean justice at last, for it may be remembered that when, in 1822, some of its inhabitants rose in revolt, sympathizing with the general Greek revolt, the Turks massacred or sold into slavery nearly all the population of over a hundred thousand persons. But the week's principal event occurred in the advance of the Servian troops through rough, mountainous Albania, and their arrival at the Albanian port of Durazzo, the ancient Dyrrachium where Cæsar besieged Pompey in B.C. 48. A place of importance under the Romans, the city has shrunk to a dilapidated town, and its formerly fine harbor is now full of silt. Its seizure by Servia is proof of her need of a seaport, but it is resented by Albanians and by Austrians. The Albanians resent it because it takes no account either of the fact that they are, as they claim, as much a nation as are any of the allies, or of their historic and national rights, or of their recently proclaimed independence. Hence, if there is elementary justice in the principle of "the Balkans for the Balkan peoples," it must be, they assert, also to the advantage of the Albanians. Austrians object to a Servian port on the Adriatic because Servia would thus cross from east to west Austria's north-to-south commercial, if not territorial, path to the Ægean. Two solutions of the difficulty have been suggested. The first is that Servia should obtain an Ægean port by making Salonika—by far the finest harbor on the Ægean, and no farther from Servia than is Durazzo—a free port. It is reported that Turkey has already consented to this. In the event, however, that Servia would not be satisfied, a port to the east of Salonika could be secured to her, Greater Servia thus extending southward to the Ægean. The second solution is that Servia should obtain an Adriatic port, subject to the same conditions as those long prevailing at the harbor of Antivari in Montenegro—that is to say, no fortifications to be built, and no war-ships, either Servian or foreign, to be admitted to the port. Thus Servia's real desire could be reached, not by military possessions, but by a guaranteed access to the Adriatic for commercial purposes only. This might be reconciled with an independent Albania.

The Balkan War: Europe

Despite the occupation of Durazzo, the danger last week of a European conflagration resulting therefrom grew less. In general, throughout Europe the disproportion between the question of a port for Servia and the untold calamities that would result from a European war were more clearly seen. Certain movements and events in particular countries were also helpful towards the trend for peace. The principal movement was in Austria. Nine of the Austrian provinces are inhabited by Slavs, and they are naturally more or less in racial sympathy with the Slavs in the Balkans. But six out of these nine Austrian provinces are not only Slavic in general, but are Serbo-Slavic in particular. The reported applause given in Bohemian Prague to the news of Servian successes, and the reported slipping across the frontier of a considerable number out of Austria's six million Serb subjects, warned the Austrian Government, lest it have trouble at home, to move cautiously in any threat to Servia. As somewhat offsetting this, in Austria's interest, Rumania began concentrating troops along the Russian frontier, and, it is said, has issued a general mobilization order. This is interpreted as forecasting the Rumanians' determination to help Austria in case of trouble with Russia and the Balkan allies. It may seem strange that Rumania should be less friendly to the allies than to Austria. The present position of the Rumanians, however, is presumably not so much one of regard for Austria as one of fear that the rise of a Big Bulgaria would make their own kingdom look small in comparison. In case of actual war Austria would count on the support of the other members of the Triple Alliance, Germany and Italy. If Russia, as the greatest Slav power, supported the Servian claim, she would be, it has been supposed, backed by the other members of the Triple Entente, France and England. But the governments of Germany, Italy, France, and England are making no secret of their strenuous counsels of moderation to Austria and Russia. In the Triple Entente, so far as the relations between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia and England are concerned, a statement was made last week that England had no intention of supporting Servia's claims by force of arms or aiding any other Power to do so. This is in harmony with Premier Asquith's recent speech, in which he declared that no "isolated question" (that is, a question concerning some specific claim) should be permitted to provoke interference in the Balkan war by inducing hostilities between interested Powers in advance of the general settlement of peace. The Premier's speech has now been followed by a proposal from Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Minister, that an international conference should take place as early as possible and that its programme, while avoiding the injection of any question that might wound national susceptibilities, like the issues directly at stake between Turkey and the Balkan States, should discuss such questions as the independence of Albania, the free passage of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, and the disposition of the Ægean Islands. The Six Powers are therefore now engaged in preparing the way for an international conference to include as well Turkey, Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, and Greece.

Football Pro and Con

Each year the American game of football is the subject of criticism and the object of attack, and each year it continues if it does not grow in popularity. A football attendance of thirty or forty thousand has become a commonplace. The crowd at a football game is not the sort of crowd that assembles at an automobile race, rather excitedly anticipating the thrill of a serious accident, and more eager when one occurs. It is the sort of crowd that enjoys the thrill of the game but dreads the casualties. When, a few years ago, a fatal accident occurred at West Point, the crowd who witnessed it dispersed with the grief of it written on their faces. Those who say that the American football crowd is like the throng at a Roman gladiatorial show or a Spanish bull-fight are slanderers. As football has been freed from serious accidents it has grown in popularity. It can never be other than a rough sport, and it is none the less wholesome for that; but it is growing more sensible, and it is all the more wholesome for that. To the undergraduate the important phase of a football game appears to be the victory or defeat at its close. Few undergraduates at Yale, for example, minimize the importance of the field goal which at the last moment tied the score with Princeton and saved the Yale team from what seemed certain defeat; few undergraduates at Harvard can forget that the Harvard team has been one of the strongest American college teams in recent years and has scored emphatic victories over both Princeton and Yale. And so along the line. Cornell men think of the strong game their team played against Pennsylvania, and the "break" by which it was defeated. Pennsylvania men think of the dramatic scores their team has made in more than one game, turning apparent disaster into triumph. Wisconsin men take satisfaction in the winning of the "conference" championship. What is lasting, however, about this season is not the victories or defeats, but the effect of gain or loss in the progress of football as a rational, manly sport. This year has afforded another test for the rules which opened up the game, as well as for the modifications of those rules made for the purpose of meeting certain practical difficulties. There seems to be little doubt that during the past two or three years there has been a reduction in the number of serious football accidents. It is certain that there has been a reduction in unfair and needlessly rough play. Several incidents can be cited to illustrate the improvement in spirit that has come over the game. In the game with Harvard the Dartmouth team was subjected to criticism for the roughness of its play. A supporter of Dartmouth, in a printed statement, in commenting upon this criticism, suggested that what appeared needlessly rough play was simply the effect upon Dartmouth players of the criticism by Dartmouth undergraduates of the earlier symptoms of lethargy in the team. It was furthermore said—we paraphrase the statement from memory—that if on investigation Dartmouth found any of its players really guilty of what was unfair, the offense would be dealt with by the College itself. A Harvard player was sent from the field for rough play, and that fact was recognized by Harvard men as a blot on the Harvard record even if the penalty was not just. A Princeton player was likewise sent from the field, and the Princeton captain came to the player's defense and declared that he was as clean a player as any on the team. There are graduates who still call themselves young men who can remember very well that, when charges of rough-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness were made, the normal answer was a counter-charge, or some cynical remark to the effect that football "wasn't marbles or squat tag." The progress in this respect has been indubitable, and the present sensitiveness to criticism shows, first, that such charges are not so recklessly made as they used to be and are therefore taken more seriously, and, secondly, that they are regarded not as a criticism upon the game itself but as a demand for adherence to the high standards of sportsmanship. One can recognize this progress and can recognize the great value of athletics and the specific advantage of a vigorous game like football while recognizing at the same time the continuance of certain evils in American college athletics. The excessive excitement over athletic contests, the extravagance in expenditure of time and money, the lack of due proportion maintained between the athletic and intellectual pursuits, all need attention. There is not a college or university in which the authorities are not immediately responsible for the conduct of its athletics. We believe that those college authorities can do very much more than they are doing now in rendering athletics more wholesome and more rational. At present this task seems to be the concern of a comparatively small proportion among the faculties of our colleges and universities. It ought to be the concern of every man in a position of responsibility as college teacher.

The Profit on Crime

The report on the State Convict Board of Alabama shows that the total gross earnings of convicts in that State for the year ending September 10 was $1,073,286.16. These figures, without taking into account the earnings of one hundred convicts who were employed on the State farm, from whom the State would have received $30,000 more if they had been leased on the same terms as the others, shows a gain for 1912 over the previous year of $16,456.93. The figures for other States where the convict lease system is in force are not at hand, but there is every reason to believe that the above is a fair sample of the profits made elsewhere. No doubt this statement of the Convict Board, coming at the time of the year when the papers are filled with the reports of bountiful harvests and bumper crops, will read to a good many people like another evidence of the prosperity of the State. Other persons, considering the dubious source of this income, will perhaps comfort themselves with the reflection that the profits of the State upon its convicts go very largely to support the public schools, and so return good for evil. How many know or have considered the actual facts in regard to the matter, namely, that under the fee system, as it still exists in Alabama and other parts of the South, the sheriff is put in the position of a recruiting agent for the employers of convict labor; that about eighty-seven per cent of all convicts of the State are Negroes, many of whom, arrested for trifling offenses, have drifted into crime because of ignorance and the neglect of the State properly to educate them; that in spite of the regulations to protect these unfortunate slaves of the State, life in the convict camps to-day is more degrading and cruel than it ever was under the worst form of slavery; that when these men are finally released they go back into the walks of daily life broken in body and embittered in mind, to become not only a burden but a menace to the remainder of the community? Considered in the light of its ultimate results to the community, this large profit from convicts' labor is not a gain —not even in the material sense—but a loss. A few private individuals may profit by this system, but the State loses. The State loses because these men from the convict camps and the mines return, at the end of their period of servitude, worse in body and in soul than they were before. No State can afford to make a business profit out of the moral degradation of any of its citizens.

A New Editor for the "Churchman"

The Rev. Herbert Britton Gwyn, of Chicago, has been elected editor of the "Churchman," which, since Mr. McBee's regrettable retirement last spring, has been without an editor-in-chief. Mr. Gwyn is a Canadian and a graduate of Trinity College, Toronto. He served as assistant in a Toronto parish, and for the past ten years has been rector of St. Simeon's Church, Chicago. Last spring the "Churchman" was purchased from Mr. Marshall H. Mallory by a syndicate, represented by the following directors: The Rev. Dr. Douglas, Canon of the New York City Cathedral; the Rev. Dr. Slattery, Rector of Grace Church; the Rev. Howard Robbins, Rector of the Church of the Incarnation; the Rev. George Alexander Strong, Rector of Christ Church; and the Rev. John Mockbridge, Vicar of Trinity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chapel—all in New York City; together with an equal number of laymen. Mr. Gywn will enter upon his new duties with the beginning of the new year. Mr. W. B. Parker, formerly associated with the "Atlantic" and later with the "Century Magazine," will continue to act as business manager of the "Churchman." Under Mr. McBee the "Churchman's" influence has been much wider and broader than that of a merely denominational paper. The Outlook sees every reason to hope that this valuable and vital influence for Christianity will be fully maintained under the new editorship.

HEALTH AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

If a father comes home from business to find one of his children seriously ill, he does not treat the matter as he would a business question. That child's illness is a bigger and more important matter to him than any mere question of dollars and cents. There is only one thing that he regards as of more consequence than the health of the members of his family, and that is their character and reputation. When illness enters his household, he needs no further argument to persuade him that human life is more valuable than property.

And yet if Americans were judged by the Government they have made for themselves, they would appear to place a higher value upon property than upon human life. The Federal Government is very well equipped, on the whole, to help farmers protect the health and lives of cattle; but it is very badly equipped to enable the American people to defend their own health and their own lives.

In this issue Mr. Earl Mayo, whose articles on the various aspects of public duty toward questions of health have evidently made a marked impression upon the readers of The Outlook, presents the facts upon which the demand for a Department of Health in the Federal Government is based. We advise our readers to read carefully Mr. Mayo's article and then decide what they wish Congress to do about this matter.

There is no question of the right of the Federal Government to conduct such a department. It has as much right, for example, to put up barriers against disease as it has to put up barriers against goods of foreign manufacture. Moreover, it is exercising its right already through various disconnected agencies, such as the Public Health Service and the officials who are engaged in the enforcement of the Pure Food Law. The question is not whether the Federal Government shall exercise the right or not, but whether it shall exercise that right intelligently and effectively by means of a single, unified, administrative body devoted solely to matters of health.

Suppose such a department were established, what would its functions be?

In the first place, there should be no misapprehension as to what those functions would not be. The Federal Department of Health would not be concerned with the treatment of individual cases of illness. It would not have anything to do with the "healing art." The officers of such a department would not be engaged in making sick people well.

Unfortunately, some of the advocates of such a department or service have done much to create a wrong impression on this point. For example, the National platform of the Progressive party, in its plank favoring the "union of all the existing agencies of the Federal Government dealing with the public health into a single National Health Service," adds the phrase: "Without discrimination against or for any one set of therapeutic methods, school of medicine, or school of healing." The platform might as well have opposed discrimination against or for any school of theology. With the work of such a Department of Health, so-called therapeutic methods, schools of medicine, or schools of healing, have nothing whatever to do. One might as well say that in establishing the Bureau of Chemistry there should be no discrimination against or for the practice of alchemy; or in the work of the Geodetic Survey there should be no discrimination for or against astrology. The Bureau of Chemistry is concerned only in ascertaining and acting upon the facts of the science of chemistry. The Geodetic Survey has only to take into account the scientific work of geographers, mathematicians, and astronomers. And so the sole basis of such a Department of Health as is proposed should be, and must necessarily be, the facts of science as ascertained by the scientific methods of the laboratory. As a matter of fact, there is no confusion regarding this. It must be remembered that there is nothing essentially new so far as the nature of the work itself is concerned. It should not be forgotten that it was the United States

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government which carried on the investigations that resulted in the expulsion of yellow fever from the Canal Zone. The Federal Government did not engage in curing people, except in so far as it employed physicians to care for those for whom it was directly responsible, as it employs physicians and surgeons in the army and navy. So far as the public is concerned, its work had nothing whatever to do with methods of therapeutics or schools of healing. It was a scientific work as firmly based upon the facts of science as the engineering work in the construction of the Canal and its locks. It was an error to introduce the question of schools of healing into the proposal for a unified public health service or department, and it should not be repeated. The one form of discrimination which such a department should practice should be against the unscientific, and for the methods of the ascertained facts of science.

The primary function of such a Department of Health is that of acquiring and distributing information. In other words, it should do for the health of the people what the Department of Agriculture is doing for the agriculture of the people. The officials in the Department of Agriculture have at no time attempted to tell farmers how they must plow their land or sow their seed. The Department of Agriculture is continually studying the question of soil, of seed, of animal life, and of agricultural methods, and is storing up and tabulating this information. And then it makes this information accessible to those to whom it will be useful; it answers the queries of farmers; it sends out its instructors. This is just what such a Department of Health would chiefly do with regard to the health of the people. At present there are no uniform vital statistics for the United States. There is no means, for example, of accurately ascertaining what the death rate in America is. Some States and some cities have vital statistics that are, in part at least, valuable, but there is no uniformity with regard to these statistics. There is no means of comparing the death rate of one city with that of the other cities of the United States. In New York City, for example, stillbirths are not counted among the births at all. In other places they are included both in the statistics of births and in the statistics of deaths. New York City can compare the death rate of children in one year with that of the previous year, and thus can measure its own progress in the immeasurably valuable work of saving infant lives. There is no way, however, by which New York can discover whether its methods are more effective than the methods of the other cities of the country, for the basis underlying its own records is different from the basis underlying the records of other cities. A National Department of Health would establish a uniform system of statistics, and would be enabled to let any city know how its work on behalf of the health of its inhabitants compared with the work done by other communities. The fight against disease cannot be carried on in ignorance. It must be based on knowledge. A National Department or Bureau of Health is the only instrument through which knowledge of health and disease on a National scale can be obtained, and it is the only agency which can distribute such knowledge Nationally.

Secondarily, its function would be regulative. Now the United States Government does to some extent establish health regulations. But only to some extent. To-day the Nation at large must depend for protection against the invasion of cholera through the port of New York, not upon its National servants, but upon officials of the State of New York. It so happens that in the past the State of New York has done some exceedingly competent work in this respect; but the people of Ohio and of Pennsylvania and of Minnesota, and of other States where immigrants go, should not have to be dependent upon the efficiency of the State Government in New York to be adequately protected against the disease which may at any time become a menace to the whole Nation by appearing at the port of New York. It is as much the function of the Federal Government to fortify the Nation against foreign disease as it is to fortify the Nation against foreign armies. It cannot do so adequately until a single, united body for that purpose is established as its instrument.

The question whether such a body should be a Department with a Cabinet officer at its head, or a bureau erected in one of the departments, or an independent commission having no relation to any department, like the Inter-State Commerce Commission, is not an unimportant question, but it is a secondary one. Mr. Mayo puts cogently the arguments for making such a body a Department in charge of a Cabinet officer. It would be better, however, to have a bureau or an inde-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendent commission rather than not to have a unified body at all. The prime duty of Congress in the protection of the health of the American people is to unite the various disconnected, and sometimes conflicting, agencies of the Government into a single body and to give it power: first, to acquire the necessary information; second, to make that information accessible to the public; and, third, to enforce generally and effectively such regulations as are now enforced by the Federal Government sporadically.

MR. WHITMAN'S CALL TO THE CITY

A dinner was given in New York City on Friday evening, November 22, to Mr. Whitman, the District Attorney, in appreciation of his successful prosecution of Police Lieutenant Becker and the four gangster gunmen. In his speech at the close of the dinner Mr. Whitman put admirably the issue before the people of the city—before the people of all cities—in saying that the question is, not whether New York City is better or worse than London, Paris, Vienna, or St. Petersburg, but whether it is the best city we can make it.

To that question there is but one possible answer: It is not the best city we can make it.

The difficulty is not that the majority of the citizens are corrupt or inefficient. They are neither corrupt nor inefficient. The American people are an honest people. They are an efficient people. There are no people more energetic and efficient in private enterprise. But in public affairs they have been spasmodic or inert.

Mr. Whitman's sentence gives the rallying cry: To make our city the best city we can make it.

How can we get together?

One party can prescribe a platform and nominate candidates and invite all citizens to join it. This method never has succeeded. Party affiliations and party prejudices are too strong. It may be desired, but it is not to be expected, that Democrats will support Republican nominees, or that Republicans will support Democratic nominees. or that either will support Progressive nominees. There are thousands of voters in New York City who would be glad to vote for a party pledged to make the city the best city that can be made, but are not prepared to commit themselves to the referendum, initiative, and recall as a means of doing it.

The different parties, through their party organizations—Democratic, Republican, Progressive, Prohibition, Socialistic, Labor—can form a coalition and apportion the offices according to the size of the various constituencies represented. This method has sometimes succeeded. It succeeded two years ago. Except the Mayor, the coalition candidates were elected, and in all those departments which the coalition candidates control New York City has had the best administration she has had for many a year—perhaps the best she has ever had.

But coalitions are generally short-lived. And behind the coalition is no united constituency to give it courage and support. A coalition is at best a temporary expedient—better than nothing, but very far from the ideal.

The ideal would be a union of all citizens in a common endeavor to make New York City the best city they could make it; a union which would no more be a coalition of different parties than the Red Cross Society is a coalition of different churches.

Such a union might be called into existence by the City Club, but its object should not be the upbuilding of the City Club, and the City Club should not control it; or by the Citizens' Union, but not to upbuild the Citizens' Union, and the Citizens' Union should not control it; or by a group of Republicans, Progressives, or Independents, but not to promote the political fortunes of either the Republican, the Progressive, or the Independent organization, and neither organization, in its National capacity, should control it. The platform should be a pledge to make New York a clean, wholesome, well-ordered city in which to live, and the candidates should be the best available men to carry that pledge into effect.

Is this impracticable?

We never can tell what we can do till we try. It was thought impracticable in 1860 to unite the men of the North in a resolute determination that slavery should not become National. But the Union proved practical. It was thought in 1840 that it would be impracticable to unite the jealous and hostile kingdoms of Italy in a united Italy. But the genius of Cavour accomplished it. It was thought impracticable six months ago to unite Montenegro, Servia, Bulgaria, and Greece in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a common effort for the emancipation of the Balkan Peninsula. But, thanks to two great statesmen, it has been done temporarily, and it is reasonable to hope that the temporary fusion may grow into a permanent union.

To-day the different commercial organizations of New York are uniting in a common effort to preserve the commercial prosperity of the city from being impaired if not destroyed by its inertia. Why should it be thought impracticable to unite the citizens of that city in a common effort to make it the best city they can make it?

The municipal campaign ought not to wait for next fall. It ought to begin now. It ought to be more than an anti-Tammany campaign; more than an anti-vice campaign; more than an anti-graft campaign. It ought to be a campaign to make the biggest city in the land also its greatest city—or at least as great as any other. It should aim not merely to elect candidates; it should also aim to study the municipal problems and to formulate some municipal principles. It should seek to find answers to such questions as these:

How to make a dock system that shall keep pace with the world's steamship systems?

How to preserve sanitary conditions in a population of four millions crowded together in so compact a space?

How to keep our streets from becoming cañons into which the sun never penetrates?

How to add new and needed thoroughfares to relieve the present overcrowded streets?

How to meet the just criticisms on our present cumbersome school organization, and make it at once simpler and more efficient?

How to reorganize our police as an army, under quasi-military control and military discipline?

How to weed out from it the few but influential members who both demoralize and dishonor it, and make it from top to bottom an organization devoted to protecting the citizens from criminals, never employed to protecting the criminals from the law?

How to unify our too complicated city government, and make all its departments co-operative because all parts of a coherent whole?

We do not here formulate any principles. We do not even attempt to state all problems. We only indicate the direction in which the citizens of New York should move if they would make that city the best it can be made.

The city has been stirred as never before by the revelations of organized crime in partnership with the guardians of law and order. Now is the time for the citizens to awake; now is the opportunity to move forward to a common end, animated by a common purpose to make the city of New York worthy of the geographical place it occupies, and the social and civic place it ought to occupy in the life of the Nation.

AUSTRIA AND THE BALKANS

Austria, of all the European Powers, has been one of the most consistent, and therefore one of the most successful, obstructionists of the principle of political independence or self-government. Her emperors and statesmen have been among the most powerful advocates of the system of aristocratic despotism—often benevolent despotism, it is true, but nevertheless despotism. France has become a republic; Stein and Bismarck made a constitutional empire of Germany; the warring Italian principalities were welded by the great Cavour into a unified democracy, with a monarch who may be called a hereditary President at its head; reactionary Spain has had little influence on European politics since the days of those two great English Imperialists, Admiral Nelson and Lord Palmerston; even Russia set free her serfs under Alexander II, and the whole world knows of the slow but sure progress towards constitutionalism within her borders during the past fifty years. It may be said that Russia, not Austria, is the greatest European opponent of free government. It is true that Russia has treated the peasants and the Jewish population within her own borders, and the inhabitants of Finland and Russian Poland who claim the right to be considered as living outside of her own borders, with a despotism and cruelty much more barbaric than any exercised by Austria in modern times. It is true that Austria, at least since 1866, has pursued a liberal and enlightened policy with regard to her own subjects incomparably better than anything the Russian populace has ever enjoyed. It is true that Austrian rule in Herzegovina and Bosnia has been far superior, politically, economically, and socially, to the misrule of Turkey. It would be unjust not to recognize the efficiency and material prosperity of Austria's administration of her own empire

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the last fifty years. But it is the prosperity and efficiency of a benevolent autocracy imposed from above, not the progress of a freely developing and self-governing people. Moreover, Austria has persistently sought to promote the autocratic or despotic theory of government among her neighbors.

The foremost name in the history of Austrian statecraft is that of Prince Metternich, who during the first fifty years of the nineteenth century was the most influential reactionary in Europe. He believed in the divine right of kings and in the divinely appointed association of Church and State. He sincerely feared democracy, and saw no safety for Europe except to parcel it out among four or five great Powers. The stability of Europe and the suppression of all democratic or "revolutionary" movements was to be insured by these great monarchical powers working together in harmony for their mutual advantage. This is the idea of the "European Concert." It is nothing more nor less than the principle which has been applied to industry in America by some of the great promoters of the "trusts" or "combines." Metternich was the apostle of the monarchical "combine," and his philosophy of government prevails to a very large extent in the administration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire to-day. Metternich was not a "robber baron," an individualistic "land-grabber," like Napoleon or Abdul Hamud II of Turkey. He believed in the "gentlemen's agreement." He wanted the monarchs of Europe to sit about a round table and divide the political profits of Europe with proper consideration for one another, but with the same regard for popular rights that finds expression in the saying popularly attributed to Commodore Vanderbilt, "The public be damned!"

A story is told of Dr. Jowett, the great liberal Anglican clergyman who was Master of Balliol College at Oxford, which illustrates the futility of an absolutist policy like that of Austria. A group of Oxford men were discussing after dinner the question as to which held the position of greatest authority, the bishop or the judge. The lawyers present claimed the honor for the judge, because he can say "you be hanged." The clergy in the party retorted that the bishop is greater, because he can say "you be damned." "Yes," commented Dr. Jowett, who had not spoken until then, "very true; but when the judge says 'you be hanged,' you are hanged!"

The trouble with Metternich's philosophy of government is that popular rights will not stay damned. Austria tried to condemn them to destruction when she urged the European Powers to forbid Cavour to federate the Italian states into one united nation and she was driven out of the Italian Peninsula for her pains.

There is every indication that she would to-day like to say to Bulgaria and Servia, You shall not make a united and constitutional nation out of the Balkan States. If this is the Austrian intention, if it is her desire to-day, as it was in 1850, to obstruct constitutionalism and protect absolutism, the liberal statesmen of Europe ought not to sit quietly by and let her accomplish so reactionary a design.

It is said that Austria is depending upon the Triple Alliance—that partnership between Germany, Austria, and Italy formed in 1883 for mutual protection against France and Russia—to aid her in the control, if not the actual subjugation, of the Balkan States. It may be so, for Austria is not sufficiently powerful to act alone in any partition of European territory. But we do not believe that Italian statesmen, familiar with the lives of Victor Emmanuel II, Cavour, Massimo d'Azeglio, Villamarina, and the other great opponents of Austria in the Italian struggle for independence, can bring themselves to support Austria in throttling the Balkan peoples in their similar struggle for independence and union.

If any reader thinks the foregoing brief interpretation of Austria's malign influence upon the development of free government in Europe is overdrawn or unjust, let him consult William Roscoe Thayer's "Life and Times of Cavour," a biographical work by an American writer which takes rank with the great biographies written in the English language. At the Congress of Paris—convened in 1856, at the conclusion of the Crimean War, primarily to settle the terms of peace with Russia, but also to determine the status of united Italy in Europe—England, under the leadership of Lord Palmerston, her Prime Minister, and Lord Clarendon, her representative to the Congress, espoused the Italian cause and gave Cavour the whole weight of their moral, if not their political, support. Austria, under the leadership of Count Buol, a faithful disciple of Metternich, bitterly opposed the creation of the new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European nation which Caviour was striving to make out of united Italy. What European diplomatists thought of Austria's arrogant absolutism in those days is indicated by two incidents of the Congress of Paris related by Mr. Thayer. At one of the sittings Count Orloff, the Russian envoy, said in a stage whisper to Cavour, "To listen to Buol you would suppose that the Austrians had taken Sebastopol." And Bismarck remarked: "If I could be as great for a single hour as Buol thinks he is all the time, I should establish my glory forever before God and man!"

The Balkan allies, not Austria, are in military possession of the Balkan Peninsula, and we cannot believe that Italy, France, and England will permit Austria to insist on distributing the fruits of the victory.

One of the most honorable and inspiring pages in the history of English diplomacy is that which records the story of England's support of Cavour and a united Italy. If England now supports the Balkan allies she will have the applause of every lover of political freedom throughout the civilized world.

RECREATIONS OF A PRODUCTIVE SCHOLAR

EDITORIAL BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT

ANYTHING that Professor Lounsbury writes is certain to be interesting. Any collection by him of the writings of others is also certain to be interesting. Probably when Mr. Lounsbury is doing what he himself is willing to accept as work, it is both so profound and so erudite that we laymen can do little but admire it from a distance. Fortunately, however, he is also willing to do what he regards as play, such as a Life of Fenimore Cooper, or a study of English adapted to the needs of those who are not scholars; and all of his writing of this lighter kind adds markedly to the sum of enjoyment of laymen who are fond of reading.

The two volumes before me illustrate the good that can be done by people of cultivation who at our different universities provide the means needed to foster productive scholarship—for, unfortunately, productive scholarship in this country is apt to be unremunerative. The slender volume on the early literary career of Robert Browning[1] is based on four lectures delivered at the University of Virginia under the terms of the Barbour-Page Foundation, a foundation due to the wisdom and generosity of Mrs. Thomas Nelson Page. The "Yale Book of American Verse"[2] is published by the Yale University Press under the auspices of the Elizabethan Club of Yale University, a club founded by Mr. Alexander Cochran. It is the kind of club the possession of which every real university in the country must envy Yale.

[1] The Early Literary Career of Robert Browning. By Thomas R. Lounsbury. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
[2] Yale Book of American Verse. Collected by Thomas R. Lounsbury. Yale University Press, New Haven.

This study of Browning particularly appeals to any man who, although devoted to Browning, yet does not care for the pieces that some of the Browning clubs especially delight in. Browning's great poems, those which will last as long as English literature lasts, are given their full meed of praise by Professor Lounsbury. The other poems, those which especially excite the interest of the average Browning Society, are treated very amusingly, and on the whole very justly. Professor Lounsbury insists that these "poems" will not permanently last, because they are essentially formless, and therefore not poetry at all, and indeed not literature. He holds that the attraction such poems exercise on certain people is the attraction of the unintelligible. Mr. Lounsbury's writings are always full of delicious touches, and he is sometimes at his best in this little volume, as, for instance, where he says, "In fact, commentaries on Browning generally bear a close resemblance to fog-horns. They proclaim the existence of fog, but they do not disperse it." One of his main contentions is that fundamentally the interest in those poems of Browning which are both very long and very obscure does not differ in kind from that displayed in guessing the answers to riddles, or, to use a more dignified comparison, from that employed in the solution of difficult mathematical problems.

I think, however, that for the admiration of these rather obscure philosophical poems of Browning there is a reason upon which Mr. Lounsbury has not touched. He says truly that the men who admire Browning are very apt to be men not especially drawn to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writers in whom lofty speculations have found their fitting counterpart in clearness and beauty of expression; and he instances Wordsworth and Tennyson as poets to be enjoyed only by men and women who have a certain degree of fondness for literature as literature. Now, I think it is true of Browning (as it is true of Walt Whitman) that many of the people who labor longest and hardest to master his meaning are entirely mistaken in thinking that they enjoy him as a poet. But I do not think that Mr. Lounsbury's explanation that they prize him only as a puzzle fully accounts for the enjoyment of many of these men, or the profit they derive from their study. The fact is that Browning does represent very deep thought, very real philosophy—mixed, of course, with much thought that is not deep at all but only obscure, and much would-be philosophy that has no meaning whatsoever. In an instance that came to my own knowledge, a class of college boys in a course of literature, after carefully studying Browning for a couple of months, and after then taking up Tennyson, unanimously abandoned Tennyson and insisted on returning to the study of Browning. These hard-working, intelligent boys were not all of them merely interested in puzzles. They were not all of them blind to poetry as such. They did care to a certain extent for form, but primarily they were interested in the great problems of life, they were interested in great and noble thoughts. Doubtless many of them rather enjoyed having to dig out the thought from involved language. But probably a greater number felt a larger enjoyment in finding lofty thought expressed in language which was even more lofty than obscure.

It is true that as a poet Browning is formless. But the poets who are great philosophers are few in number, and great philosophers who have any gift of expression whatever or any sense of form, or whose writings so much as approach the outer hem of literature, are even fewer in number. Browning the philosopher is not more deep than many other philosophers, and in form and expression he is inferior to many poets. But he is a philosopher, and he has form and expression. The philosophy he writes is literature, even though hardly in the highest sense poetic literature. Therefore he appeals to men who are primarily interested in his writings as philosophy, but who do derive a certain pleasure from form or expression; who, without being conscious of it, do like to have the writings they read resemble literature. These men are given by Browning something that no other poet and no other philosopher can give them; and I do not think that these men receive full justice at Mr. Lounsbury's hands. Moreover, as compared to Tennyson or Longfellow, or any other of the more conventional poets—and I am extremely fond of these conventional poets—there is far more in Browning, even in Browning's simpler and more understandable and formal poems, that gives expression to certain deep and complex emotions. There are many poets whom we habitually read far more often than Browning, and who minister better to our more primitive needs and emotions. There are very few whose lines come so naturally to us in certain great crises of the soul which are also crises of the intellect.

"The Yale Book of American Verse" is an excellent anthology, and the preface is one of the best things about it. In this preface Mr. Lounsbury quite unconsciously shows why he appeals to so many men to whom a college professor who is nothing more than a college professor does not readily appeal. He mentions that on the march to Gettysburg he picked up a torn piece of newspaper containing certain verses which have always remained in his mind, and which he includes in this collection of verse. This is the only hint in Professor Lounsbury's writings that he fought in the Civil War. A Professor of English Literature in a great university who in his youth fought at Gettysburg must necessarily have something in him that speaks not only to scholars but to men.

This anthology includes hymns as well as secular poems. The collection is good in itself, as I have already said, and, moreover, to all real lovers of anthologies it will also seem good because each of them will take much satisfaction in wondering why certain of his or her favorite poems have been left out, and why certain other poems have been put in. I suppose every man who cares for poetry at all at times wishes that he could compile an anthology for his own purposes. I certainly so feel. I would like to compile two anthologies, one of hymns and one of those poems which our ancestors designated quite ruthlessly as "profane," in opposition to sacred. I should not expect any one else to read either of my collections. I should not wish the edition to consist of more than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one copy. But I would like, purely for my own use, to own that copy! In the anthology of hymns, for instance, besides all the great hymns, from Bernard of Morlais to Cowper and Wesley and Bishop Heber, I would like to put in some hymns as to which I know nothing except that I like them. Every Christmas Eve in our own church at Oyster Bay, for instance, the children sing a hymn beginning "It's Christmas Eve on the River, it's Christmas Eve on the Bay." Of course the hymn has come to us from somewhere else, but I do not know from where; and the average native of our village firmly believes that it is indigenous to our own soil—which it cannot be, unless it deals in hyperbole, for the nearest approach to a river in our neighborhood is the village pond.

As for the "profane" anthology, I think I should like to make one consisting of several volumes. Even Mr. Lounsbury's volume of American verse, though it contains some specimens of verse I would not have included, omits others which I certainly should put in. And then, think of the many, many volumes that would be needed to include the English poems, and the French poems, and the German poems from the Bard of the Dimbovitza, and all the other poems which no human being could make up his mind to see any anthology leave out! I fear that a perfect anthology of the kind that fills my dreams would be as large as the various rather dismal series of volumes which contain, as we are told, "the world's best literature"—and doubtless would be as unsatisfactory.

Meanwhile, as all this represents an unattainable dream, we have reason to be glad that Mr. Lounsbury's particular anthology has been published.

THE RAILWAY ARBITRATION: A REVIEW

I—THE FACTS OF THE CASE

THE settlement by a Board of Arbitrators last week of the long-standing dispute between the locomotive engineers and the railways in the eastern part of the country is of almost unprecedented importance, because of the wide extent of this labor struggle, because serious interests pertaining to the public at large are involved, and most of all because of its bearing on the fundamental questions in future dealing with industrial railway wars. Both sides to this particular controversy have accepted the award, and that in itself, although it was fully expected, is a happy augury for authorized arbitration under similar conditions.

THE HISTORY OF THE CASE

Six months ago, when it seemed almost inevitable that a railway strike of colossal proportions would take place that might paralyze the business of this country even as for a short time the commerce of England was paralyzed a year ago, there was set in motion a means and agency of conciliation provided under the laws of the United States. The locomotive engineers on fifty-two railways in the so-called Eastern District of the United States demanded that their wages should be, as they called it, "standardized," and also relatively equalized with the wages of the engineers on the roads westward. Their complaint was not so much of low wages as that there were great inequalities among the different roads involved, and that the same service on the different roads ought to meet the same reward. There were also other demands, but all of them had as their moving cause the desire to establish equal conditions and equal pay among railway engineers the country over. Their union, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, is not only one of the strongest labor organizations in the country, but one which in the past has been reasonable and conservative. These demands were flatly and apparently finally rejected by the railway companies, on the ground that to yield would involve a cost of seven million dollars a year, and that conditions of business made this impossible. The threatened disastrous conflict was first postponed and is now finally averted through the prompt action of Judge Knapp, of the United States Commerce Court, and Mr. Neill, of the United States Labor Bureau. The Erdman Law gave the opportunity for arbitration, although it did not compel arbitration. Under its provisions the President may appoint any member of the Inter-State Commerce Commission or any member of the United States Commerce Court to act as a mediator with the United States Commissioner of Labor, and these two are instructed to offer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arbitration when either one of the parties to a railway labor dispute asks for such action. It did not appear probable that either would so ask; but, without sitting supinely while a labor war broke out and commercial interests were imperiled, the two men we have named, relying on the implied permission of the law, sought out the official representatives of the railways and of the union, and by every means in their power urged them toward conciliation. Presumably neither side dared take the responsibility and opprobrium of refusing mediation and thereby closing the railways and blocking the transportation of half the Nation. Each appointed its representative on the board—for the engineers, Mr. P. H. Morrissey, formerly head of the Conductors' and Trainmen's Union, and a man of unquestioned ability and fairness; for the railways involved, President Daniel Willard, of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, a road which has an enviable reputation for its treatment of its employees. As it did not seem possible for the disputants to choose a single man to act as a third arbitrator, a larger board was selected, under the provisions of the law, by mutual consent. Its members, in addition to those already named, were Oscar S. Straus, former Secretary of Commerce and Labor, who was Chairman; Albert Shaw, editor of the "Review of Reviews;" Otto M. Eidlitz, former President of the Building Trades Association; Charles R. Van Hise, President of the University of Wisconsin; and Frederick N. Judson, of the St. Louis Bar. As these five men were named by the Chief Justice of the United States, the United States Commissioner of Labor, and the Presiding Judge of the United States Commerce Court, it is evident that the interests of the public at large were adequately and prominently brought before the Board of Arbitration, as assuredly the nature of the case and the large principles involved demanded.

THE TWO CONTENTIONS

Leaving aside exact figures and precise claims as to wages, it should be pointed out that each side in this controversy put forward a contention based upon a broad economic theory, and applicable to many other economic and financial problems now before the country. These two contentions have been thus stated in these columns: "The engineers declare that for public safety only men of high skill and experience should be employed; that living cost has so increased that former wages are insufficient; that if skill and care among those who constantly have our lives in charge is to be maintained, living wages must be paid, and that the time has come for a movement in this direction. On the other hand, the companies reply that if they increase the pay of engineers they must ultimately increase the pay of all employees; that this means a charge on the railways which can be met only in one of two ways—by raising rates (to which the Inter-State Commerce Commission objects) or by decreasing dividends. The railway managers seem to take it for granted that the first course is really the only available one, and argue that railway stock is so widely held in small amounts that to decrease dividends would be not only to lower the market value of stocks and thereby injure business, but to decrease also the incomes of such an enormous number of people that it would really be a blow at the consumer—that is, the user of railways." And The Outlook commented as follows: "This is a question which requires calm consideration, for it affects industrial conditions fundamentally; it may, however, be said that no large industrial concern dealing with public safety and public comfort should be allowed to make the payment of large dividends its first consideration; before dividends should come fair treatment and reasonable pay to its employees, safety and reasonable treatment for both employees and public, and finally the maintenance in proper condition of the industry itself. So long as the alleged necessity of maintaining the stock market value of securities and of keeping up whatever dividend rate has been established are considered paramount, the industrial question in its largest aspects will remain unsettled." Thus the engineers, well paid though they are, may naturally lay stress on the terrible strain of their service and the responsibility for human life upon them; and, on the other hand, the railways may with considerable reason urge that they must not be forced to pay higher wages and at the same time be debarred from raising their rates.

THE THIRD PARTY IN INTEREST

It is a long cry from the day when the public first heard the heartless saying, "The public be damned!" as applied to railways. Now it is admitted by all, except a few rock-bound and mediæval-minded economists, that the public is not only a third party in rail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way management, but that it is *the* most important party; and that questions of wages and rates are subordinate to human safety, to reasonable comfort for passengers, and to justice and fairness in charges for both passenger and freight transportation. This is clearly stated in the award of the Board of Arbitration. It is pointed out that the population of the area served by these roads is forty per cent of the total population of the country, and that the section involved represents at least four-tenths of the wealth of the entire United States. A strike such as was contemplated would have cut off food supplies from the big cities in the East within a week, while their milk supply might not have lasted over a day. "It is evident," says the award, "that for a great section of the United States a railroad strike can no longer be considered as a matter which primarily affects the railroads, operators, and employees. It is therefore imperative that some other way be found to settle differences between railroads and their employees than by strikes."

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

It might fairly be argued that this state of things would justify legislation for the appointment of a Board of Compulsory Arbitration. It is The Outlook's belief that the Erdman Law should be modified so that the machinery of arbitration might be set in motion, not only (as now) upon the application of one of the parties to the dispute, but on the official application of the Government, as representing the public, or of private individuals among the public whose interests are threatened. What the Board of Arbitration in this case suggests might, however, bring about the same results, without the form of compulsory arbitration. It recommends the establishment of Federal and State wage commissions which shall exercise the functions regarding labor engaged upon public utilities analogous to those exercised by the public service commissions with regard to capital. The Board says: "While the railway employees feel that they cannot surrender their rights to strike, if there were a wage commission which would secure them just wages the necessity would no longer exist for the exercise of their power. It is believed that in the last analysis the only solution—unless we are to rely solely upon the restraining power of public opinion—is to qualify the principle of free contract in the railroad service." And it adds: "It is well understood by the Board that the problem for which the above plan is a suggested solution is a complex and difficult one. The suggestion, however, grows out of a profound conviction that the food and clothing of our people, the industries, and the general welfare of the Nation, cannot be permitted to depend upon the policies and the dictates of any particular group of men, whether employers or employees."

If this plan were put in operation, the new Commission would exercise authority over labor disputes on railways just as the Inter-State Commerce Commission exercises authority on other railway matters. And as hearings from both disputants as to the questions involved would certainly be held, the decisions would have the effect, though not the form, of compulsory arbitration. A necessary adjunct to this plan would be some way of penalizing the unions or otherwise enforcing strictly and promptly the decrees of the Commission.

THE MINIMUM WAGE QUESTION

The award recognizes the minimum wage principle. It was impracticable for the Board to decide whether an increase of wages should be granted on all of the fifty-two roads, or upon some and not upon others, or how much the increase should be for each class of service on every road where it was granted. The complications as to the classes of service (whether day or night, or freight or passenger, for instance) were intricate and almost innumerable. It was necessary accordingly to fix on some principle under which the basis of a fair wage should be found. The Board held that it ought to take into account the relation of compensation of engineers to that of other classes of employees, both in the Eastern District and all over the country. A minimum wage for each class of work was the only way out. The award may be illustrated by taking one case alone: for engineers in passenger service the minimum wage is fixed at $4.25 per day. This increases pay for engineers in most of the roads involved in the arbitration, but not in all; in other classes of service many of the men on some roads will have to submit to a lower wage in order that, under the minimum wage plan, their fellow-workmen on other roads may receive an equal reward for their work.

DISSENTING VIEWS

Both Mr. Morrissey for the engineers and President Willard for the railways have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accepted the decision, and both the Brotherhood and the railways will loyally abide by the award, which will be enforced, however, only up to May 1, 1913. This short time is due, first, to the fact that the Erdman Law provides that such an award shall be enforced for one year, and, secondly, to the fact that the award is retroactive, dating back from May 1, 1912. Mr. Morrissey and Mr. Willard have expressed (the first formally in a minority report, the second informally) their dissent from some of the findings of the Board. While Mr. Morrissey acknowledges that there has been a gain in essentials and that a step forward has been taken in the standardization of engineers' rates and of conditions for the Eastern District, at the same time he expresses the belief that the award will have the effect of retarding the progress of arbitration in the settlement of industrial disputes on the railways. He contends that the award does not settle the important principles raised by the engineers, and claims not only that it is based upon statistics that are unreliable for the purposes for which the Board used them, but that the Board also erred in the application of these wage statistics. For this reason, he says, "while the engineers will faithfully abide by the award during the period that it is to continue, at the same time it can be only temporary because its fundamental basis is so insecure." He dissents from the majority of the Board in their recommendation that wage commissions be established with power of compulsory arbitration, although he suggests that there are some important activities to which such commissions might profitably give attention. A striking suggestion is made in his recommendation that hereafter arbitration boards should be so constituted that none of the parties composing them—not even representatives of the public—should have a majority of the members; that the majority should be constituted by the representatives of at least two of the parties agreeing.

Mr. Willard, on the other hand, says:

> My acceptance of the award as a whole does not signify my approval of all the findings in detail. It is intended, however, to indicate clearly that, although the award is not such as the railroads had hoped for, nor is it such as they felt would be justified by a full consideration of all the facts, yet, having decided to submit their case to arbitration and having been given ample opportunity to present the facts and arguments in support of their position, they now accept without question the conclusion which was reached by the Board appointed to pass upon the matters at issue.

Thus ends peacefully what threatened to be a gigantic and calamitous industrial war.

II—THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED

The Board of Arbitration lays down three principles which appear to The Outlook of great importance and essentially just. Upon two of these the Board is apparently unanimous; upon the third there is a dissenting opinion. And this opinion is entitled to great weight, both from the character of Mr. Morrissey, the representative of the engineers on the Board, and from the fact that in it he personally reflects the general opinions of the railway employees. With regard to this controversy three principles seem to us clearly applicable:

1. Three parties are affected by a controversy between the owners and the employees of a railway: the owners, the employees, and the general public; the interests of the last are of paramount importance, but have too generally been disregarded. The railway system of the United States is to the community what the arterial system is to the individual. Its stoppage is fatal to well-being, and may easily prove literally fatal to many lives. For it inevitably and necessarily deprives the great centers of population of the supplies of food and fuel. The highways of the Nation must be kept open and unimpeded. We add that, if this cannot be done by private ownership, public ownership will be substituted. To public ownership there are serious objections. But they are not so serious as the food and fuel famines which follow from railway wars.

2. The employees must be paid a fair compensation. If the railways are not able to pay such compensation, they must obtain permission from the Inter-State Commerce Commission to raise their rates, or must act on Mr. Brandeis's suggestion of a year or two ago and by increased efficiency and economies in other directions secure the necessary funds.

The first duty of a railway corporation is not to pay dividends to its stockholders, important as that duty is. Its first duty is to operate the highways of the Nation efficiently and honestly. To do this it must keep the roadbed and rolling stock and stations in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good condition; but it is equally essential that it keep the men who operate the railway in good condition. These two things are necessary to enable the railway corporation to do the business for which it has been created; only thus can it render to the public the service for which the public has given to it its charter. Not until it has paid the necessary operating and maintenance expenses are there any profits, and dividends are profits. If in any one year it cannot keep the road and the men in good condition and divide profits, it must do its work without profits. If it cannot permanently keep the road and the men in good condition and divide profits, it will naturally go out of business, and the public will have to take it up or the railway will be abandoned. But dividends never ought to be paid out of the wages of the men or out of money temporarily saved by the deterioration of the road.

We believe that the public will with substantial unanimity sustain these two principles: the interests of the public are paramount, and the payment of a fair wage must precede the payment of a fair dividend.

And we also believe that the public will be willing to pay such price for transportation as will enable the railways to pay both a fair wage and a fair dividend. But they are not willing to leave the railway corporation the sole judge of what is fair.

3. The third principle is thus stated in the daily press account of the report of the Board:

> In many respects the railroads are subject to the Inter-State Commerce Commission and various State Commissions. The same is not true of the employees of the railroads, the Board says. This disparity of status suggests the creation of Federal and State wage commissions which shall exercise functions regarding labor engaged in work upon public utilities analogous to those exercised with regard to capital by the public service commissions already in existence.

From this suggestion Mr. Morrissey, former Grand Master of the Railroad Trainmen, who in the Board represents the engineers, dissents. He says:

> I wish to emphasize my dissent from that recommendation of the Board which, in its effect, virtually means compulsory arbitration for the railroads and their employees. Regardless of any probable Constitutional prohibitions which might operate against its being adopted, it is wholly impracticable. The progress toward the settlement of disputes between the railways and their employees without recourse to industrial warfare has been marked. There is nothing under present conditions to prevent its continuance. It will never be perfect, but, even so, it will be immeasurably better than it would be under conditions such as the Board proposes. The peace that would satisfy such an ideal condition as that had in mind by those making the recommendation would be too dearly bought even if it could be attained. To insure the permanent industrial peace so much desired will require a broader statesmanship than that which would shackle the rights of a large group of our citizens.

Compulsory arbitration would promote rather than prevent labor wars, unless it can be so framed as to secure the approval of the trainmen. But in it we can see nothing essentially inconsistent with either justice or liberty. The same objections were made a quarter of a century ago to the creation of commissions to regulate the owners of the railway that are now made to a commission to regulate the operators of the railway. The creation of such a commission rests in both cases on the same fundamental principle: The railway is a public highway; the owners and operators of the railway are servants of the public; and the public interests are paramount.

There would be nothing inherently unjust in enlisting trainmen as soldiers are enlisted, provided a speedy hearing for all complaints and a prompt and efficient securing of justice can be obtained for them. Such a system would not be unjust. It would not be inconsistent with liberty. It might be impracticable. The real question is, Would it work well?

The first Federal Railway Commission had only power of investigation and advice. Such a commission could hardly be objected to by Mr. Morrissey. And it would be a great advantage to the public and to the men themselves to have such a commission, clothed with authority to investigate all complaints and all labor difficulties affecting transportation, either at the request of the parties, of a third party, or on the initiative of the commission itself. It is quite possible that an informed public opinion is all the compulsion that is required in any labor war. It is certain that in many labor wars no other compulsion is needed. Under present conditions neither the public nor the stockholders, and in many cases not even the men themselves, have sufficiently accurate and authoritative information concerning the facts to form a just judgment respecting the merits of the controversy. Some method of securing a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just judgment comes first. How to enforce such judgment may be left for future consideration.

The Outlook heartily seconds all three of the recommendations of the Arbitration Board.

THE BECKER CASE

A POLL OF THE PRESS

DEATH sentences have been pronounced on Police-Lieutenant Becker and his four hirelings for the Rosenthal murder in New York City, and have called forth much interesting newspaper comment. As to the crime itself, the opinions of many journals are thus summarized by the Peoria, Illinois, "Herald-Transcript:"

The story of the killing of gambler Rosenthal reads like a tale of some morbidly imaginative fiction writer. The sharing of the spoils with the various gambling-houses by the police, the exercise of autocratic power by the lieutenant and his men to compel professional murderers to remove objectionable "squealers," and the perfect nonchalance with which these hired assassins performed their work are details which strain the normal man's imagination.

Two newspapers opposed to capital punishment thus comment. One of them is the Ogden, Utah, "Standard:"

No murder trials have given more general satisfaction than those in which Lieutenant Charles Becker, who instigated, and the four gunmen, who participated in, the murder of Herman Rosenthal in New York, have been found guilty of murder in the first degree. . . .

We are, on general principles, opposed to capital punishment; but in this instance we would not raise the slightest protest if Lieutenant Becker, "Lefty Louis," "Gyp the Blood," "Dago Frank," and "Whitey" Lewis were sent heavenward as were the leaders of the Sepoy mutiny in 1857. New York State has our permission to assemble the entire police force of New York City and, in the presence of officers and men, blow Becker and his gang of cutthroats to Jericho.

The other paper opposed to capital punishment is the La Crosse, Wisconsin, "Tribune." It remarks:

The men are about as depraved, as brutal, as the limits of human degradation permit. When we read of the doings of their kind, we forget, for the moment, that we are opposed to capital punishment. . . .

It is to be regretted that other contributors to the Rosenthal murder—men as low and dangerous as the five convicted—are to go free as a reward for furnishing information which led to the conviction of the five assassins. However, it is probably true that were informants refused immunity, it would become impossible to convict the ringleaders of criminal cliques anywhere.

As to the trial itself, the Sioux Falls, South Dakota, "Argus-Leader" speaks in common with very many newspapers throughout the country in declaring:

The unanimous verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree rendered by the jury in the gunmen's trial, after deliberations that lasted but seventy minutes, is the climax to one of the most sensational cases ever tried in the New York courts. . . .

It took fifteen days to try and convict Becker; the trial of the gunmen lasted about the same length of time, an unusual thing in the courts, especially in the New York courts. . . .

It was indeed a great trial; it might be called a model trial. . . .

It was a great trial, because it was conducted in the presence of the most formidable of all oppositions: that which is hidden, and is fostered by wealth and power.

"It is well to give credit to Justice Goff," adds the Peoria, Illinois, "Herald-Transcript," "who ruled without reference to quibbling in the trial of the cases, and to the jurymen, who placed their own lives in more or less jeopardy in fearlessly pronouncing judgment on members of the most cold-blooded fraternity in the world."

"Aside from the value of the service performed for the community by Justice Goff in the cases of the five murderers of Rosenthal," remarks the Philadelphia "Times," "that jurist has benefited the community in a large degree by setting a salutary example to his associates on the bench of the Supreme Court." The "Times" then explains:

Justice Goff has shown them that even the most conspicuous murder trial, in which experience and cunning are enlisted for the defense, does not have to be dragged out to a weary length as a theatrical spectacle; does not have to be conducted at the mercy of hair-splitting counsel; and can be brought to a rapid finish without a loss of dignity by the court and without a scandalous miscarriage of justice through mistrial or failure of the jurors to agree.

All the presiding judge needs to run his own court is hard common sense and a determination to get at the essentials. Lawyers will yield when they find he means business, and respect him for his firmness. By teaching this lesson to lawyers and judges Justice Goff has set a standard, at least for celebrated cases, so far above what was accepted in the Thaw trial, and even before that, as to cause the community to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gasp. He deserves a special word of thanks for setting a precedent from which judges hereafter will not depart without inviting censure.

Commenting upon the significance of the trial of the gunmen, the Milwaukee "Sentinel" says that "the death sentence in the case of the four gunmen should work a radical change in the mental processes of the bad element in New York's East Side." The "Sentinel" adds:

The general change to be wrought was illustrated in the expression that sprang to the faces of the four men when the evidently unexpected verdict of guilty was pronounced. It was one of dazed surprise and consternation. Why? A local observer says:

"They had seen many men—gangsters—murdered, and in nearly every case the murderer had got away and policemen had let it be known that it was a good thing the man was killed."

That puts in a nutshell one phase of the peculiar psychology of East Side thuggery. Murder as such was not regarded as a particularly serious thing, either legally or morally.

The point to consider was the chance of getting away scot free; and in the chances of cases typified by the Rosenthal murder—murder, that is, committed within the circle of the "underworld," with its police and political connections—the chance of escape was as ten to one against the chance of punishment.

The New York "Sun" points out the fact that the word "gang" includes "not merely the desperate and ignorant brutes who do murder for a wage and exist only by toleration of the police." The "Sun" adds:

It describes the gamblers who thrive through police corruption, the policemen who fatten on the earnings of crime, the landlords who rent their property for illegal establishments, the dishonest and the inefficient executives who, for profit or through incapacity, permit the gigantic conspiracy of criminals to exist. Collectively, these are to-day recognized as the gang. Each stands in the same dock with Becker and his crew.

The cause of New York City corruption is municipal politics, declares the Peoria "Herald-Transcript." "Trace the case of the Rosenthal murder back to its source," it says, "and you will find that the tragedy which has brought five men to the electric chair and made New York's Police Department a subject of National contempt goes back to the admixture of partisan politics and municipal business."

In fact, municipal politics in New York is a business in itself—a business at which hundreds of men make their living, and at which other hundreds have grown wealthy more easily and more quickly than they could have done in almost any other line of endeavor.

Elections in New York are not decided on the basis of what is good for New York, as a rule, but with consideration for the jobs involved. . . .

Police-Lieutenant Becker, reaping his harvest from the gamblers, doubtless felt that he was merely gathering in his legitimate share of the spoils due the job he held.

What is involved in this relationship between politics and systematized, commercialized crime is vividly explained by Magistrate Joseph E. Corrigan in his article "Magnates of Crime" in "McClure's Magazine" for November. Judge Corrigan concludes his article with definite proposals for the reform of police administration and court procedure.

The Los Angeles "Municipal News" was established by the citizens of Los Angeles through an initiative ordinance adopted in 1911. It is published weekly by the city of Los Angeles under the direction of the Municipal Newspaper Commission. It says:

New York's police scandals and the Becker trial have informed the world of the helpless condition of the people of New York City, so far as the government is concerned. The great city is managed under laws made at Albany, and much of this lawmaking is through trades with New York's Tammany-made membership in the Assembly. . . .

New York has reached the point that it obeys what laws it wishes to. Obedience is determined largely by the police and the magistrates, and they have been shown to be the sunshine of vice growth.

New York might restore efficient government and suppress official crime without home rule, but those who have studied the latest presentation of facts agree that home rule is the first step the great city must take before it can purge itself.

With home rule, with the right to make its own laws, institute its own government, and make and unmake its officials, New York will be in a position to gain a character for municipal honesty. Los Angeles knows the value of home rule by experience, and joins in the wish that New York may have it soon, if that be the means of attaining virtue.

Says the Springfield, Massachusetts, "Union:"

Mayor Gaynor's attacks on ministers and social workers for their methods in attempting to make New York a more moral community have been based on the assumption that because of the character of New York's population and its position as the center of activity of all kinds in the East, it cannot be of as high morality as smaller communities. The Mayor has been answered by the clergymen themselves, but the other day his position was attacked by a group of men who represent the ideals of the public, but are not necessarily professional reformers. Among them was District Attorney Whitman, who said it angers him to hear it said that other cities are worse than New York. "Our ideal should be to make it as good as it can be made," he says.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NEW POWER IN EUROPE

BY STEPHEN VAN RENSSELAER TROWBRIDGE

THE outstanding fact revealed by the war thus far is the rise of a new power in Europe. The energy, ability, and patriotism displayed by the Bulgarian army have riveted the attention of the West. We can scarcely imagine what must be the feelings of the Russians, who have hitherto disdainfully treated Bulgaria as a dependent principality, but who must now fully recognize the intense feeling of nationality which has inspired "the young giant of the Balkans." Greece, Servia, and Montenegro have carried out their parts in the invasion of European Turkey, and they have been in almost every instance victorious. But the force and mass of the Bulgarian advance and the fact that Adrianople, once the proud capital of the Ottoman Empire, and Constantinople, the present capital, are upon the verge of capitulation, give to this intrepid little nation a new prestige and a dominating influence in eastern Europe. David has gone forth against the champion of the Philistines.

In a democratic country like Bulgaria the army is the product of the people. It is not the machine of a monarch. And back of the army are the thrift and self-sacrifice of a nation of peasants. The national traits are stolidity (in contrast with the hot-tempered and capricious peoples of southern Europe), thrift, especially in agriculture, indomitable courage, and a passion for education. In some respects the Bulgars betray their Oriental origin. Their complexions are rather dark, and the Tartar or Finnish elements in their physiognomy are often strongly marked. The peasant women carry the household burdens and walk deferentially behind their husbands. The younger women deck their hair, as in the East, with strings of coins, and they love garments of brilliant colors. The shepherds are clad in sheepskins, and the creaking wagons, drawn by oxen or buffaloes, are followed by rough-looking drivers carrying goads in their hands.

But the highland climate of the Balkans and the purity of the home life maintained through a thousand years of national existence have combined to make the Bulgars a singularly strong-built race. Both men and women are broad-shouldered, and they stand erect. Smoking is not common, and drunkenness in public is very rare. Street quarrels and riots are almost unknown, in marked contrast with the noisy demonstrations of Greek and Albanian towns. The mass of the people are peasants occupied with farming, pasturing flocks, lumbering, and the culture of roses. It is one of the ironies of history that the very battlefields near Tirnova and the Shipka Pass, where the Russians bore down upon the Turks with such relentless hand-to-hand fighting in the blizzards of the winter of 1877, are now planted with rose-bushes. Attar of roses is distilled from the petals, and forms one of the chief exports of the country.

The city life in Bulgaria is distinctly Western. Municipal improvements have been rapidly made since the Turkish yoke was thrown off in 1878. Schools and gymnasia have been established in all the large towns, and the homes are built in European style. A university was erected in Sofia in 1907, and Philippopolis (the ancient Philippi of the New Testament) has a *gymnasium* which cost $150,000; this corresponds, roughly speaking, to our high school. The *lycée* for girls in the same town is well administered and well attended. It is interesting to note that, while the Bulgars have an intense love for education, the theaters are very poorly attended and are opened only occasionally. The people are made of sterner stuff than their neighbors, the pleasure-loving Serbs. The practical nature and shrewd judgment of the Bulgars are shown in the fact that, instead of keeping their Turkish prisoners in useless confinement, they have put eight thousand of them to work building the emergency railway to communicate with the field of war.

The history of the Bulgars, which is certainly a dramatic one, falls naturally into six periods:

1. *Invasion* from the valley of the Volga westward and southward across the Danube during the seventh century. This was a period of crude barbarity, before the tribes had come into contact with the Christian faith. The Slavic inhabitants in the region of the Balkans were subjugated and absorbed into the Bulgarian stock, giving to the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

querors much of Russian literature and usage, in very much the same way that the conquered Arabs have influenced the form and spirit of Turkish literature. The cities of that region were wrested from the Byzantine Empire. Krum, the battle-lord of the Bulgars, a ruthless barbarian, defeated the Greek Emperor, advanced to the walls of Constantinople in 813 A.D., and humiliated the Byzantines by exacting a tribute. He devastated the surrounding country and carried off a vast number of women and children captives. The prisoners, many of them priests and even bishops, did not hide their faith from their captors, and so successful was their preaching that many of the enemy were deeply influenced. The execution of four bishops and several hundred Christians only increased the devotion of the missionaries. Within a generation converts were found throughout the tribe, and in 864 A.D. King Boris himself accepted the Christian faith. Since then Bulgaria has remained a part of the Greek Orthodox Church, though with a national organization of its own.

2. *The Golden Age*, extending throughout the tenth century, is dear to the hearts of the Bulgars. For during this period the boundaries were extended by conquest so as to reach from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, and from the Danube to the Ægean. The title of Prince was superseded by that of Czar. National histories and poems were written in the Cyrillic character. The sermons of St. Chrysostom were translated into Bulgarian and the monasteries flourished. But an invasion by Byzantine armies rudely interrupted this prosperity and peace. The diadem of the Bulgarian Czars was captured and brought to Constantinople, where it was offered up as a trophy in the Church of Santa Sophia. For two centuries an intermittent warfare distressed the land, the sturdy Balkan mountaineers maintaining a certain degree of freedom.

3. *The Turkish Supremacy*, which began with the Mohammedan victory of Kosovo in 1389 and lasted until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, is the gloomiest epoch of Bulgarian annals. Certain tribes were persuaded to accept Islam, and their descendants to-day are known as Pomaks, or Moslem Bulgars. The Turkish practice of carrying off the flower of the Christian youth every five years to serve in the corps of Janissaries in Constantinople was a terrible grievance to the people. The Bulgarians were forbidden to build new churches, the noblest of the ancient churches were forcibly transformed into mosques, taxes became exorbitant, and forced labor was introduced, with torture and imprisonment as the alternative. Brigandage flourished, and the villagers were ground down under manifold hardships. Records for these five centuries are scarce, because the native language was prohibited by the Turks, libraries were burned or captured, and the clergy were required by the Mohammedans as a matter of policy to chant the liturgy in the Greek language. This long period of misgovernment and repression ended in a great tragedy: the massacre of over fifty thousand Bulgarian men, women, and children at the instigation of the Turkish authorities. The pretext for this fearful onslaught was a conspiracy and a local insurrection near Philippopolis in May, 1876. But the fiercest massacre was perpetrated in the town of Batak, a long distance from the troubled district. The Christian population of 7,000 men was entirely disarmed, Ahmed Agha, the Turkish lord, giving his oath that "not a hair of their head should be touched." Then the defenseless multitude was furiously set upon by the Turks under the command of Ahmed Agha. Great numbers took refuge in the church. The roof was torn off by the Turkish soldiers, who flung burning pieces of wood and rags dipped in petroleum down upon the helpless Christians. In other parts of Bulgaria similar outrages occurred by secret consent of the Turkish Government. The Turks had taken care to isolate Bulgaria from communication with Europe. The first authentic news of the massacre came to President Washburn, of Robert College, at Constantinople. "At the outset," says Dr. Washburn, "we alone had had these details, and what we did with them is no secret. It was no secret at the time that we gave them to Sir Henry Elliott, the British Ambassador. We did this in the hope that he could make the Turks see that they were making a terrible mistake. We also communicated the facts to powerful friends in England, to Mr. Pears, correspondent of the daily 'News,' and to the correspondent of the London 'Times.' Could we have done less?" The result was that Mr. Gladstone published his famous pamphlet, and by his impassioned eloquence helped to swell the torrent of indignation that swept through Christendom. Dr. Washburn's record gives such a graphic picture of the intricacies and disappointments

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the diplomacy in the Near East that I venture to quote somewhat at length:

It was under Abd-ul-Aziz that the massacres were planned and commenced. But we had to face a more serious difficulty. It was to be expected that the Turks would deny everything; but Mr. Disraeli, the English Prime Minister, declared in Parliament that the reports, for some of which we were responsible and which he must have known came from us, were "mere coffee-house babble" and without any foundation—that he had official information to this effect. We begged Sir Henry Elliott to send one of his own secretaries to Bulgaria to investigate and report to him. After excusing himself for some time, he sent for me one day and told me that he had at last received orders to do so, and that he would send Mr. Baring down to see me before he started, which he did. But before that I had learned from Sir Henry himself that he was not only sending his youngest secretary, who knew but little of the country and none of the languages, but that he was to get his information from the Turkish authorities and to be in the country only two or three days. I protested in vain, although Mr. Baring agreed with me. Sir Henry told me that he was acting under instructions from home. This made it clear that there was to be no real investigation, and what was wanted by Mr. Disraeli was an official report to confirm his statements that nothing serious had happened in Bulgaria. There was nothing left for us to do but to defend our honor and our veracity as best we could. I went at once to the American Minister, explained the situation to him, and begged him to send Mr. Schuyler, who had just arrived in Constantinople as Secretary of the Legation and Consul-General, to make an independent and impartial investigation of the situation in Bulgaria with proper interpreters for Turkish, Bulgarian, and Greek. He said that he had no authority to do this, but that, if I could persuade Mr. Schuyler to go, he would find a way to send him. I found it easy to persuade Mr. Schuyler, and he left Constantinople with his interpreters the day after Mr. Baring, overtaking him at Adrianople. Mr. Baring was an honest man, and I do not think that he was sorry to find himself checkmated at the beginning of the game. He saw at once that Mr. Schuyler's report would be accepted and believed by all the world. I do not know what report Mr. Disraeli got. He did not publish it; but the first result of Mr. Schuyler's preliminary report, made in ten days, was to convert Mr. Gladstone and make him the leader in the great agitation which finally overthrew the Disraeli Government, and which before that led to the Conference of Constantinople. Mr. Baring went with Mr. Schuyler to Batak and saw with his own eyes the unburied bodies of some five thousand men, women, and children who had been slaughtered in this one town, far from the seat of the insurrection. Our graduate, Mr. Peter Dimitroff, went with Mr. Schuyler as his Bulgarian interpreter. Could we have done less than this under the circumstances?

Having been through the very midst of the Adana massacre in 1909, I can imagine the heartbreaking scenes in the Bulgarian towns at the time of which Dr. Washburn writes. The Turks have certainly done their utmost to retard the civilization of Bulgaria. At last the tide has turned against them. A British correspondent, in speaking of the flight of the Turkish population before the onrush of the Bulgarian armies in the recent advance upon Constantinople, remarks:

One thought strikes an observer forcibly at seeing the Turks migrating back to their ancient home, namely, how little altered after five hundred years are the wanderers, returning practically in the same manner in which they came into Europe—the same rough wooden carts, dragged by bullocks or buffaloes, and covered with straw matting, which conceals the household lumber, and the female members of the family hunched into the smallest conceivable space peering with sad eyes at the unfamiliar sights, while the sheep and goats are prevented from straying by the youngsters of the family.

4. *Emancipation* from the Turks came with the Russian invasion of 1877 and the Treaty of San Stefano. But what was hailed at first as liberation proved to be an exchange of masters, for the policy of Russia in demanding "autonomy" for Bulgaria was to reduce that state to the sad condition of Finland and Poland. The young nation, to use a phrase of Prince Bismarck, had thus been "put in the saddle," but had not yet "learned to ride." A Russian prince was sent into the country to assume control pending the calling of a Parliament and the choice of a King. For the astute policy of Russia designed to give the Bulgars a self-contradictory Constitution, apparently very democratic, but with the possibility of leaving extraordinary power in the hands of the King should he prove to be the willing agent of Russia. The articles were so drawn up that a deadlock in politics was likely, thereby inviting Russian intervention. When the first National Assembly convened at Tirnova, it was composed of 213 Bulgarians, mostly peasants, who had had absolutely no experience in government. Military conscription and elementary education were made compulsory. All titles of nobility were prohibited. Freedom of the press was guaranteed. Prince Alexander of Battenberg, a nephew of the Russian Czar, was called to the throne. This young man, who was at that time serving as a Prussian officer at Potsdam, consulted Prince Bismarck, who advised him to accept, adding that a reign in Bulgaria would at least be "a pleasant reminiscence."

After due formalities Prince Alexander,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amid great enthusiasm, took the oath to the Constitution at Tirnova on the 9th of July, 1879. But the Prince had been placed in an impossible position. His career, far from becoming "a pleasant reminiscence," rapidly grew more and more tragic. He found himself surrounded by Cabinet officers who were delegated from St. Petersburg. The arrogant Russian generals absolutely controlled the newly organized army, and dictated their orders without any regard for Bulgarian feelings. The short boundary war with Servia, instigated by Russia, which ended with the complete defeat of the Serbs at Slivinitza, aroused profound admiration in the hearts of the Bulgarians for their new King. For he showed reckless courage upon the field of battle, and soon came to be known as "the hero of Slivinitza and the champion of Bulgarian freedom." Baffled by his growing power and popularity, the Russian agents conspired to seize him secretly and deport him to Russia. This shameful plot was carried out in the dead of night. The Prince was hurried away under threats of assassination, across the Russian border. The expectation was that in the resulting chaos Russia would step in and assume control. But the St. Petersburg diplomats had failed to reckon with the patriot-statesman Stambuloff, who was Speaker of the Bulgarian House and the embodiment of the new national spirit. He was "the Bulgarian Bismarck," and the entire nation rallied to his leadership. Prince Ferdinand, of Bourbon descent, was invited to the throne, and a policy of emancipation from Russian tyranny was openly followed. After the bitter experience of seven years under the Czar's autocracy the Bulgarian peasants declared that they hated the Russians even more than the Turks.

5. The period from 1885 to 1912 has been one of *free development*, not without diplomatic hindrances and annoyances, but affording this little nation of mountaineers the first fair chance for industrial and educational advance. The result has been scientific development of the natural resources of the country and practical experience in self-government, which has given to the common people courage and self-control. The army has been steadily increased, and has been equipped with the most modern arms, no doubt with a premonition of a struggle with the Turks or Austrians. But the failure of the historian rightly to interpret contemporary conditions is illustrated in the fact that one of the most observant English writers recently said that "the old feeling against the Turks has all but died away," and "the Bulgarian atrocities of 1876 have left no traces behind." What would he say of the battle of Lule-Burgas, when the Turks were hurled back in bloody defeat, or of the terrific bayonet assaults upon the Tchataldja forts? The period of free growth and general prosperity has been made the means for extensive and secret preparations.

6. The new period upon which the Bulgarian nation has just entered is that of *expansion*. National ambition is at the root of this, although the desire to free the Christians of Macedonia is very strong, and the instinct of revenge no doubt plays a large part in the motives of the war. Bulgaria can scarcely expect to weld into an empire the other Balkan kingdoms. But the annexation of the lion's share of Macedonia and the humiliation of Turkey will be sure to give this intrepid nation a dominant influence in the peninsula and a direct share in the future politics of Europe. Sir Frank Lascelles once expressed his judgment that the Bulgarians possessed more common sense than any other people he knew. This rare quality of common sense, which no doubt the Bulgars do possess in a much larger degree than any of their neighbors, will help them to work out a reasonable plan for economic expansion and national progress.

America has given to the Bulgarians two priceless gifts: the translation of the Bible into the vernacular and the educational inspiration of Robert College and the American College for Girls (now called Constantinople College). The excellent translation of the Bible, made by a joint committee of American missionaries and native associates, all of them scholarly and experienced linguists, has wrought a strong influence in the renascence of the Bulgarian language. My grandfather, Dr. Elias Riggs, served on this committee. The spiritual and moral force of the Word of God thus intimately brought to every Bulgarian fireside, and even into the school life of the children, is one of the hopeful signs for the future of the nation. The quiet, uplifting influence of the Protestant churches established in Samakov and Philippopolis, and the recent student mass-meetings in Sofia addressed by Dr. John Mott and Mr. Sherwood Eddy, are other instances of American contact and inspiration. The work of the American Board at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Monastir, in European Turkey, is also largely for Bulgarians.

But Robert College, situated on the Bosphorus, and presided over for thirty years by Dr. George Washburn, a lover of the Bulgarians, met the aspiration of the new nation in its hour of greatest need. And what Robert College has been to the young men, Constantinople College has been to the young women and to the homes which have produced the new generation.

From the year 1870 to 1890, when Bulgaria was coming to feel a new consciousness and a new ambition, the young men had no college of their own. Even the schools were very elementary, and there was a pathetic scarcity of teachers. The result was that the boys came crowding to Robert College, where they found a warm welcome and a vision of Western education. Such was the influence of this American college that when the first National Assembly met at Tirnova in 1879 for the adoption of a Constitution, one of the acts of the Assembly was to pass a resolution of gratitude to President Washburn and Professor Long for what they had done toward the elevation and independence of Bulgaria. The Assembly was a unique one, made up largely of peasants, some of them in their sheepskin clothes. Excepting for a group of Robert College graduates, no one knew anything about parliamentary law.

The direct political influence of the College has been very great. In the summer vacation of 1877 Dr. and Mrs. Washburn, to renew old friendships, visited the graduates who were residing in Eastern Rumelia or South Bulgaria. The trip proved to be like a royal progress. Everywhere bishops, military officers, and even the Governor of the province entertained and honored the American guests. A military escort was sent with them from town to town, and they were met at the railway station by the Mayor of Philippopolis. In 1895 the College was honored by a visit from King Ferdinand himself. While he was taking tea at the President's home the King remarked that Robert College had been a nursery for Bulgarian statesmen, and that he hoped it would continue to be so. An incidental note by Dr. Washburn is of dramatic interest: "He did not know it, but he drank his tea out of a cup that once belonged to his grandfather, then Louis Philippe, King of France." Relative to the statement by King Ferdinand, it may be said that for a certain period all the Bulgarian Cabinet Ministers except one were graduates of this College. Prince Alexander, when he commenced his reign in 1879, chose Mr. Stoiloff, of the class of '71, to be his private secretary and confidential adviser. Professor Panaretoff, of the College faculty, was sent to London by Prince Alexander on a special mission to the British Government. The class of 1881 may be taken as an illustration. There were twelve graduates, of whom nine were Bulgarians, two Armenians, and one Greek. Six of the Bulgarians became teachers and one an editor. Four were promoted to important official positions. One has been for many years in the diplomatic service. Mr. Slaveikoff, of the class of 1871, was Minister of Public Instruction until his death. Mr. Stoiloff held the highest positions in the Government and was the best-loved statesman and patriot of his day. The two representatives of Bulgaria at the Hague Conference in 1907, General Vinaroff and Judge Karandjuloff, were Robert College men. Students often overcame great obstacles in traveling to the College, which was situated in their enemies' country. In one instance a party of twelve young Bulgars from places only two or three days from Constantinople were four weeks making the journey. Having vainly tried two routes and having suffered a week in the wretchedness of a Turkish quarantine station, they started a third time and came over the mountains in carriages.

What was it that drew these young men to leave their fatherland and spend the best years of their young manhood in the Turkish capital? Perhaps the natural trend of their aspirations may be understood from the subjects of the orations delivered by the students on a certain Commencement day in the eighties. (And I remember from my own student days in Robert College that the Bulgarian boys were frequently victorious over others in athletic and oratorical contests.) When it is remembered that the spies of Abd-ul-Hamid prevented free speech in all other parts of the city and imprisoned persons suspected of modern ideas without any process of trial, such subjects as these are the more remarkable: Christianity and Patriotism, The Dark Ages, The Influence of the Fine Arts, Representative Government, Violation of Popular Rights, Man and Nature, The Destiny of States and Nations. No wonder that the Russian newspapers often attributed the anti-Russian feeling in Bulgaria

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the influence of Robert College! In a direct political sense the charge was false. But indirectly it was true.

Yet, with all this freedom of expression within the College campus, there have never been any serious disturbances among the students. It has been well said that the College is "a perpetual peace conference between all the nationalities and religions of the Near East." Once, during the perilous days of Russian invasion, the College was attacked by a Mohammedan mob; but the firmness and presence of mind shown by Dr. Washburn and Dr. Long halted and finally dispersed the mob.

It would be mere speculation to forecast the future of Bulgaria. But it seems clear that a nation which has so long held its Christian faith under an overwhelming Moslem domination, a nation which has made its home life the center of fidelity and affection, a nation that has dared to defy the proud Empire of Russia and has ventured to attack the old enemy of Christendom, has yet to reach its true Golden Age when the principles of an enlightened and benevolent Christianity are more thoroughly understood and more implicitly obeyed.

It seems almost certain that the rich and fertile province of Adrianople will be added by this war to the domain of King Ferdinand. This will give a free outlet through the Ægean Sea and will insure to Bulgaria a share in the commerce of the Mediterranean. If the port of Rodosto and the western shore of the Sea of Marmora are permanently occupied, the Turks will be well-nigh driven out of Europe. Salonika, the objective of the Greek campaign, has been taken. The fall of Monastir, with the surrender of five Pashas and fifty thousand troops, has brought decisive victory to the Servian arms. This will nerve the Bulgarians for a final effort. The desire of the troops is set upon celebrating mass in the ancient and majestic Church of Santa Sophia, the jewel of Christendom, condemned since 1453 to be used as a Mohammedan mosque. Meanwhile the scourge of cholera holds the striving nations in suspense. If Constantinople is forced to capitulate, the Bulgarian nation will have won one of the decisive victories of the world's history.

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONAL HEALTH

BY EARL MAYO

IT is estimated that the total physical wealth of the United States is $110,000,000,000. This is the computed value of all the land and all the buildings, all the mines and mills and factories, all the railways and other transportation facilities, all the domestic animals and farm products—in fact, everything in the country that possesses a monetary value except the people themselves. This is a tremendous sum, and the analysis of its components affords plenty of opportunity for indulging in the American fondness for big figures. We all share a little of the pride with which the Secretary of Agriculture makes his annual announcement of the $9,000,000,000 total which represents the yearly value of our agricultural products. We like to contemplate our $17,000,000,000 worth of railways, our $15,000,000,000 annual output of manufactures, and the serrated rows of figures which represent the many items in our National industrial economy. It is a proud record, and it shows that the people of the United States are the richest of the world's great nations, the foremost in material prosperity.

But what of the one item omitted from the above compilation of the country's assets? How about the value to the Nation of the 90,000,000 individuals who compose it? We are accustomed to think of the value of a thing as the price which it will bring, but that of course is based upon its expected productive power. The activities of human beings are the factor that gives value to all other material possessions; and while the daily papers give no quotations of the latest market values of human lives in New York or Chicago, it is possible to estimate the average worth of a life at any stage of its progress on this same basis of its anticipated earning power less the cost of its maintenance.

Experts in the complicated subject of social statistics, following this system, have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

figured out for us with elaborate care the economic worth of human life at every period from infancy to advanced age. The dollar value of life increases steadily from birth to maturity, and then declines slowly as the expectation of life decreases. Different estimates vary somewhat for all ages on account of the impossibility of determining with exactness the average earnings of all classes of the population. Adopting for this average figure the sum of $700 a year—which probably is too low to be accurate for Americans—the monetary value of the average life in the United States is found to be a little less than $3,000, varying from $90 for the newborn infant to $4,100 for the matured adult of thirty. These are the figures employed by Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale, in his valuable report to the National Conservation Commission on the subject of National vitality, and they certainly are not excessive.

Adopting Professor Fisher's figure of $2,900 as the average value of the lives of Americans, we find that what may be termed the vital assets of this Nation of 90,000,000 inhabitants amount to upwards of $250,000,000,000, or nearly two and one-third times the entire amount of its other wealth. Although the material progress of the country has been remarkable and the expansion of its industries presents an astonishing record of growth, its most valuable crop is still the human crop; its most important business is the growing of sturdy men and women; and its greatest problem is the conservation of its *human* resources.

The vital stock of the Nation is receiving continual additions to capital in the form of births and is being constantly depleted by deaths, just as, with the merchantable forms of wealth, old capital is being steadily wiped out and new capital created. In the United States the excess of births over deaths has been augmented by a very heavy immigration, so that the supply of vital assets has increased very rapidly. This rate of increase is bound to lessen in the future, and a wise policy of foresight dictates the necessity of care and study in the elimination of the great wastes now caused by accident and disease, which involve not only an impairment of vital assets but also a loss of monetary capital through its investment in the expenses of unnecessary sickness or in lives cut off prematurely.

In the absence of exact registration of deaths in a large part of the country, it is impossible to tell the precise number of lives lost every year as a result of violence and disease. For those cities and States which do keep a record of this matter the rate is about 16.5 for each thousand of the population. There is no reason to suppose that it is less for the remainder of the country. It is safe to say, therefore, that 1,500,000 deaths occur in the United States every year.

The big fact in connection with this million and a half yearly deaths is not their tremendous total. It is the undeniable truth that a very large proportion of them are preventable—that is, postponable for longer or shorter periods. There is no good reason that anybody can adduce why 130,000 Americans should die every year from pulmonary tuberculosis, or upwards of 30,000 from typhoid fever. The degree of preventability varies greatly, of course, with different diseases. In the case of some it is possible by means already known to bring about their total extinction. Others baffle medical skill and thus far refuse to yield to medical research, so that they are not at all preventable under present conditions.

If we make up a table, however, and include in it the number of deaths from each cause and the degree of preventability that we may conservatively ascribe to each one with our present knowledge of preventive measures, we find that the average percentage of avoidable deaths from all causes is 40 per cent. In other words, 600,000 of the 1,500,000 deaths that occur in the United States every year represent absolute waste—unnecessary waste.

In this army of 600,000 victims, uselessly sacrificed at the rate of 50,000 a month, are children in whom are centered the hopes and pride of parents, young men and women just ready to enter on careers of usefulness, earners whose families are deprived of comfortable support, young mothers snatched away from little children who need their care. It is impossible to picture the woe and misery and needless suffering for which these avoidable deaths are responsible; but, to return to the economic phase of the subject, it is possible to compute with fair accuracy the tremendous loss resulting from them.

Most of the unnecessary deaths occur among children or among those who have scarcely reached maturity. The median age of death from pulmonary tuberculosis is 33, and from other forms of tuberculosis 23. For pneumonia it is 37, and for typhoid fever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

26. For diphtheria, on the other hand, the median age is three, and for the gastro-intestinal diseases which yearly decimate the children in our large cities the middle age falls in the first year.

Since the diseases most largely preventable bear chiefly on the earlier periods of life, the value of any postponement is considerable. Using the figures previously employed for the monetary value of life at different periods, we find that the average worth of each of the 600,000 possible prolongations is $1,700, or a round total of $1,000,000,000 that could be added annually to the vital assets of the Nation by the adoption of preventive measures entirely feasible.

The methods required for the prevention of unnecessary deaths would at the same time do away with much preventable illness. The conclusion of the most widely recognized authority on the relative extent of sickness and mortality is that for each death there is a little more than two years of invalidity. Applying this rate to the United States, it follows that there are on the average 3,000,000 sick persons in the country at all times. Many of these cases of invalidity are among the very young or the very old, but at least one-third of them are among persons in the productive periods of life, the great majority of whom are engaged in productive occupations. Averaging the earning power of the million workers constantly incapacitated by sickness at only $1.50 a day, the loss of earnings from this cause amounts to $450,000,000 in the course of a year. The cost of medical care, medicines, and nursing averages at least a dollar a day additional, or a yearly total of over $1,000,000,000. Applying to the sum of these two amounts the 40 per cent which represents the preventable portion of this illness gives a figure of more than $500,000,000 as the possible yearly saving on this score, and makes the potential addition to National resources through the elimination of avoidable sickness and death more than $1,500,000,000 a year.

Consideration of a few of the factors that contribute to this vast total indicates that the amount named is probably below rather than above the true figure. It is estimated that the number of persons in the country suffering from tuberculosis is approximately half a million, and of this army perhaps one-half are incapacitated from work, while the productive power of the others is more or less seriously affected. Of the deaths that occur during the period of early maturity one in every three is caused by this disease, which reaps a harvest of more than 130,000 lives every year and costs upward of $200,000,000 in loss of earnings and expense of care, aside from the $250,000,000 that represents the value of the lives destroyed. If the members of the medical profession were given a free hand to deal with this disease, backed by adequate provision for the care of existing cases, tuberculosis could be practically stamped out within a single generation.

The widespread continuance of typhoid fever is absolutely without excuse. Its existence is an indictment of our civilization. Yet it kills something over 30,000 Americans every year—good, sturdy Americans, most of them, just at the prime of life and with their economic value to the Nation at its highest. An expert authority on this subject has placed the annual cost of typhoid to the American people at $212,000,000. Half of this waste could be prevented by the installation of pure water supplies in the typhoid-ridden communities of the country. Half of the remainder could be eliminated by other simple preventive measures. A reasonable estimate of the yearly saving that could be made in this disease alone is $150,000,000.

The mortality from diphtheria has been lowered greatly since the discovery and adoption of its antitoxin, but it still destroys as many lives as typhoid. A remarkable reduction has been accomplished in the deaths caused by the other diseases of childhood, but nearly one-fifth of all the children born still die within the first year, and more than one-quarter before they reach the age of five. Of this slaughter of the innocents fully one-half could be avoided. Out of the 400,000 children who die every year in the United States, 200,000 or more might be preserved to lives of future usefulness by the adoption of preventive measures well within present knowledge.

The cost of what are usually described as social diseases is quite impossible to estimate, but a distinguished authority makes the statement that they are responsible for half the cost of all our institutions for the care of defectives. It is well known that they are among the heaviest contributors to infant mortality, to insanity, and to certain other diseases which are of particularly serious import for the reason that their frequency is increasing instead of decreasing. Certainly the loss to National efficiency which they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impose is not less than that caused by tuberculosis.

This list could be amplified to include many other diseases that we know how to prevent but do not prevent. Within recent years, for example, medical research has conquered malaria; but still there are from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 cases of malaria in the United States every year, representing a monetary loss that runs into the millions. Nobody who has given the matter any attention whatever can doubt for a moment the tremendous size of the stake set before us as a reward for the intelligent conservation of National human resources. The prize is the most gorgeous ever offered to a people. What are we doing to earn it?

The story bids fair to become a classic of the farmer who wrote to the Department of Agriculture about his sick hog and received prompt advice that saved the porcine life, while his neighbor who applied to Washington for information that might help his sick wife was informed that the Government could do nothing for her. The usual moral drawn from this tale, that it is better to be a sick hog to be looked after than a sick human being to be neglected, is one that we ought to revise. Suppose we make it read: It is better for a Government, after providing fully for the health of the $250,000,000 worth of American hogs, to pay a little attention to the health of $250,000,000,000 worth of American citizens. Still, we are not in a position to blame Uncle Sam too severely for his neglect in this matter. Too many of our own health habitations are of glass. The man of wealth gives instant attention to the slightest ailment of his favorite horse or his pet dog, but he neglects his own physical troubles until their accumulated total becomes hopeless. The workman declines to make use of the safety device installed for his own protection because it is "too much trouble." We all have too much the point of view of Uncle Samuel. We realize that there is money in hogs. We fail to realize that there is money—a lot more of it—in men. We need to be educated out of our National habit of carelessness in matters of health; and this is a work that the National Government can undertake better than any other agency, through a Department of Health, just as it is daily educating the farmers through the Department of Agriculture to make their acres more productive, to make their herds more valuable, and to protect their crops from the attack of pests that frequently assail them.

It will not do to assume, because the Federal Government gives slight heed to the physical welfare of the general body of citizens, that it pays no attention whatever to health conditions. In a small way it operates a number of agencies charged specifically with the task of looking after health conditions in certain restricted spheres. These health agencies are scattered among the different departments of the Government, including the State, War, Navy, Treasury, Agricultural, Commerce and Labor, and Interior, besides independent bureaus for the District of Columbia and in the Government Printing Office. Approximately $15,000,000 a year is appropriated by Congress for the work of these independent and unrelated agencies. Among them there is inevitably much duplication of equipment and of effort. Duplication means waste. More important than this waste, however, is the fact that there are great gaps left unfilled between the activities of these bureaus, and these gaps comprise the most important fields that governmental effort in behalf of public health should cover, because they are the fields occupied by the greatest number of persons.

Of the Congressional appropriations for health purposes, the larger part, about three-fifths, goes to the medical departments of the army and navy, and of this amount more than three-quarters goes to the army. An efficient medical corps is recognized as an essential feature of a modern fighting force. The United States has able men in these branches of its service, but the service itself is organized in such a way as to reduce their efforts in many cases to the minimum of efficiency. The youngest lieutenant of the line can upset the most careful arrangements of the best sanitarian in the service if he chooses to do so.

When the Japanese engaged in war with Russia, their health officers went ahead of the army, selected the camp sites and made provisions for their sanitation. The result was that they went through that conflict without the usual army scourge of typhoid fever and with an immunity from the diseases ordinarily attendant upon military operations that aroused the admiration of the world. In our own brief conflict with Spain the health officers were ignored. The location and arrangement of camps were dic-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tated by line officers, most of them entirely inexperienced in such matters. As a consequence twenty thousand American soldiers were attacked by typhoid, and more than fifteen hundred were killed by it. Nor were the greater number of cases of the disease confined to Cuba. The camps at Chickamauga and other points in the United States established a frightful record in this respect and were responsible for the major part of the sickness and deaths.

After the war, when the United States took charge of Cuba, it happened, by a circumstance almost accidental, that a man of medical training, General Leonard Wood, was placed in command of the island. Under his administration members of the medical service, with outside volunteers, under the direction of Dr. Walter Reed, were intrusted with the work of investigating yellow fever. They found how the disease was spread and how it could be prevented, with the result that the mortality from yellow fever, which had been 428 to every hundred thousand of population in Havana in 1897, was stopped absolutely by 1902. The city, and to a great extent the whole island, was cleared of its worst scourge. This work, which is a striking illustration of what can be accomplished under favorable conditions, has been worth millions of dollars to the United States by protecting our own Southern ports and by teaching us how to combat this dreaded scourge. The inquiry naturally arises, Why are not conditions made favorable for such work at all times and in all places? If we are justified in cleaning up Cuba, why are we not justified in cleaning up the plague spots within our own domain? If it is good business to drive malaria out of the Panama Canal Zone, why would it not be good business to drive it out of our Southern States, where 2,000,000 persons suffer from its attacks every year? Is there any good reason why we should hesitate to create a department of our Government with the ability, the power, and the prestige necessary to do systematically for the people of the continental United States what we have been able and willing to do in isolated cases for our neighbors and our dependencies?

One of our National health agencies to which the statesmen at Washington point with pride whenever their derelictions in the matter of provision for the public health are mentioned is the Public Health Service. Nobody has ever ventured to attack the personnel of the Public Health Service or the efficiency of its efforts whenever it has been able to work with a free hand. But the point is exactly here—that it is not likely to be allowed a free hand in any serious crisis.

The visitor from Mars inspecting our governmental scheme probably would have considerable difficulty in guessing the department of the National administration to which this important health agency is assigned. It is unlikely that he would seek for it under the Department of the Treasury, but that is where it has been placed. The head of this Department is selected for the position because of his knowledge of finance. Usually he is a banker. He is kept so busy looking after matters of revenue, trying to prevent customs frauds, dealing with an occasional panic, and attending to the multifarious duties connected with the financial side of his work that he would need to be superhuman to have any time left over to devote to the question of public health. By the very nature of his position, as well as by his training, the subject is unlikely to possess any strong interest for him, and the health service is one of the very minor divisions of his Department.

One striking instance may be cited to show what happens to a Public Health Service administered by the financial officer of the Government. More than ten years ago, in 1900, or possibly a year or two before that, bubonic plague appeared in San Francisco. Its presence was determined by the absolute identification of cases in that year. Bubonic plague is a terrible disease. It has been a scourge of the Orient for centuries. As many as a million persons have died in the course of a single epidemic. The discovery of plague in any city is sufficient cause for serious alarm—not for a panic, but for the sort of alarm that expresses itself in prompt and vigorous efforts to prevent the spread of the disease and to stamp it out.

Was San Francisco alarmed? Most assuredly it was; but its alarm took the form of an all-controlling fear that the presence of the plague might become generally known, that visitors might be kept away from the city, that "business" might suffer. After the first announcements all the power of the controlling business interests of San Francisco was devoted to suppressing knowledge of the existence of the disease in the city. The local newspapers were throttled, and printed bitter denials of the facts instead of the facts themselves. The press associations, by per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suasion or intimidation, were prevented from carrying news of the situation to the outside world. It was so difficult to get at the truth of the situation that the New York newspaper with which I was then connected sent a prominent medical man to San Francisco to investigate. But the influence of San Francisco business interests extended clear across the continent and was exerted upon this newspaper even before its commissioner had completed his work. The newspaper was not thoroughly intimidated. The report of its medical investigator was published, and it showed the existence of plague in San Francisco, but it was so toned down as to minimize the apparent danger.

When the outbreak first came to the official knowledge of the San Francisco Board of Health, that body declared a quarantine against the Chinatown district of the city. Chinatown was one of the sights of the city, an attraction to visitors. An obliging circuit judge was found, a United States judge, to declare this quarantine illegal, and in doing so he rendered the extra-judicial opinion that "there is not now, and never has been, a case of plague in this city."

For the protection of the remainder of the country the officials of the Public Health Service declared a quarantine against the State of California. It was beyond the power of local judges to remove this barrier to the spread of the disease, but it was not beyond the power of the big business interests that had accomplished so much already in the direction of suppression. The report of the members of the Service who had proved the existence of plague was discredited and denied and the men themselves were sent to remote and foreign stations. It was not until the following year that a commission of prominent scientists was appointed to make an investigation which showed conclusively the existence of numerous cases of plague in the heart of San Francisco. Even then the report of this commission was not given out promptly, as required by law, but was held back until the substance of its findings had been published by medical journals and by the Sacramento "Bee"—not, it will be noted, by the San Francisco newspapers, although these might have been expected to find the keenest news interest in the findings of the commission. But for this independent publication it might have been very much longer before the report would have been allowed the sight of day.

The Federal Government has spent more than a million dollars in killing rats on the Pacific Coast, and these sums have been supplemented by local appropriations. Business interests do not object to rat-killing—unless too much noise is made about it—but it is much easier to stamp out a danger of this sort in the beginning than to overtake it after it has gained great headway.

In other parts of the country the same effort of business interests to suppress unpleasant facts has been witnessed, though usually not on so extensive a scale as in the struggle by California to hide the bubonic plague. I was in New Orleans at the time of the last serious outbreak of yellow fever. For ten days before any statement appeared publicly in reference to the disease its presence in the city was a matter of common knowledge. It was the subject of earnest but subdued discussion on the Board of Trade and in the hotel lobbies. It was talked over in the newspaper offices. During all this time the strongest kind of pressure was exerted by important business interests to secure the adoption of a policy of concealment. Publication of the truth would hurt business, they argued. The city would feel the effects for years. The effort failed, thanks largely to the determined stand of a fearless and independent health officer. New Orleans attacked the outbreak openly and vigorously; the co-operation of the Public Health Service was obtained, and the city was thoroughly cleaned and put into a condition which makes it unlikely that it will ever again suffer seriously from yellow fever. Had the business opposition not been conquered at home, it is difficult to say how far-reaching the mischief might have been.

In connection with this San Francisco incident it is not necessary to attribute consciously improper motives to the Secretary of the Treasury or to any one else connected with the Federal Government. No doubt there were—or were supplied—satisfactory reasons for transferring the men who refused to close their eyes to the existence of plague in San Francisco. Accustomed by virtue of his position to give chief consideration to the demands of business, a Secretary of the Treasury would be likely to be moved by the argument that a certain policy would involve serious financial loss. But if a matter of this sort were in charge of a Secretary of Health, appointed to give chief consideration to the public welfare and responsible for the effect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his actions upon the public health, his decision in such a case would be likely to be altogether different.

The greater number of the National agencies dealing with the subject of health are under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture and are adjuncts of his Department. Of these the one that bears most directly upon the health of the people is the Bureau of Chemistry, intrusted with the administration of the Pure Food Law. This law was passed for the protection of the public from impure and adulterated foods and drugs, but to the minds of many persons some of the rulings under it have been designed to interfere as little as possible with the business of those interests that fought its enactment tooth and nail. The persistent thwarting of Dr. Harvey W. Wiley's efforts to enforce the Pure Food Law formed a principal cause of his resignation as Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, and was done with the sympathy of some of his influential associates in the Department of Agriculture. This was possible because the Department under which Dr. Wiley's bureau did its work was devoted primarily not to questions of health but to questions of industry and production. It is perhaps not remarkable that to the mind of a Secretary intent on the prosperity of our tremendous agricultural industry the interests of the men who handle a vast bulk of the products of the farm loom larger than those of the well-intentioned fanatics who desire to avoid eating products preserved with injurious chemicals. A Secretary of Public Health would view the subject from a different angle.

Potentially one of the important agencies for public health is the Division of Purification of Water Supplies. At present this is an appendage of the Bureau of Plant Industry in the Department of Agriculture, a location which is not likely to give it great influence or opportunity for effective action. There is a big job waiting for just this sort of a body in the prevention of the great amount of typhoid caused by the pollution of lakes and streams used as sources of water supply. In a department and with a position that would enable it to cope with this difficult task, it might easily become the means of saving millions of dollars to the Nation every year through the restriction of this one disease. Another subordinate branch of the Department of Agriculture that might be made of vastly greater scope and value if it were made part of a comprehensive department devoted to the subject of health is the Division of Nutrition, which is devoted to determining the effect of various substances upon the body and the relative value of different foodstuffs. There is a vast field for experiment in this direction that might shed important light upon the problem of preventing certain serious diseases.

In the Department of Commerce and Labor are two important agencies that could be made vastly more effective if they were included in a Department of Health. The Bureau of Labor has made occasional studies of the health of workers in various trades, of the relation between occupation and disease, of factory sanitation and industrial hygiene. So far as its resources allow, it has been nibbling at the tremendous problem of the health and efficiency of our industrial workers—a problem that requires long, detailed, and systematic study, such as probably would be given to it by a National Department of Health.

In the Census Bureau, a branch of the Department of Commerce and Labor, is the Division of Vital Statistics. The subject of American vital statistics is one that it is difficult to discuss without using intemperate language. For, roughly, half our population we have no vital statistics worth mentioning, and for the other half they are so incomplete and inaccurate that no European authority will accept them without serious qualification. It is in no wise the fault of the census officials that this condition exists; but there is at least reason to hope that if the subject of health were raised to its proper position of dignity and importance, this phase of it, so essential to the correct understanding of vital conditions, would receive due attention.

Scattered among these various bureaus and divisions are sixteen chemical laboratories, all doing more or less similar work, and four pharmacological laboratories, all engaged in research in the action and standards of drugs. Were these twenty separate laboratories combined into two—one chemical and one pharmacological—there would be not only a great economy through the avoidance of duplication in equipment and effort, but there would be also a fair chance of the creation of a great National chemical laboratory fully equipped for studying the important problems of National scope that are pressing for solution.

More important even than the need for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expansion in the work of those National health agencies now in existence is the necessity for attention to great problems now receiving no attention whatever. The study of the causes of disease, the conditions that lead to its spread, and the measures necessary for its prevention, is surely a task of National size. Yet this is a subject that our proud Nation is content to leave to the private philanthropy of a Rockefeller, a Phipps, or a Russell Sage. Not only is such effort of vast possibilities in adding to the comfort and happiness of the people of the country, but there is money in it, as we have seen—more money than there is in preventing hog cholera or exterminating the boll-weevil, important and praiseworthy as these movements unquestionably are.

The greatest single work that awaits a National Department of Health, however, is educational work—the spread among the people of the United States of a practical knowledge of the means by which diseases already shown to be preventable can be controlled and exterminated. This work might well follow along the lines employed so successfully by the Department of Agriculture in teaching the farmers of the country how to combat insect pests, plant blights, and animal diseases. The need for this work is the real reason for the creation of a *Department* of Health, rather than a Bureau—that it may command the attention of the people, that its messages may come to them with authority, and that the consideration of the whole subject may be placed upon the plane which its importance deserves. Here again we have an excellent analogy in the Department of Agriculture, which has increased tremendously in value and influence since it was raised from the position of a mere Bureau to that of a full-fledged Department. Such educational work as a National Department of Health could do and should do would be a most potent influence toward saving the billion and a half dollars of waste now annually incurred through preventable sickness and death.

Who shall say that the subject of health is not of sufficient importance to deserve such treatment? As has been shown, it vitally concerns our most valuable National assets, the one thing on which depends the value of all our material wealth, the safety and very life of the Nation itself. At the same time, it should be pointed out that it is the members of Congress who are quibbling about forms, about the rights of this and that branch of the Governmental machine, about the advisability or inadvisability of increasing the size of the Cabinet. The workers for more adequate National attention to this tremendous problem of human conservation are not sticking at forms. They see a great work and a great need, and are anxious that the work be begun and the need be satisfied as quickly as possible. Their position was fairly presented by Dr. Wiley when he said, in answer to a question put at one of the Congressional hearings on this subject:

> I do not care anything about the name of the department. I would like to see one department—I do not know what you would call it—charged with the public health, public education, and public welfare, without being mixed up with promoting trades or extending agriculture or anything else—one department absolutely altruistic, which could stand above every interest and every demand of greed and graft which comes so often to us all from all parts of the country. You want to do something for the public health, and somebody comes up and says, "You are interfering with my business if you do it." How many thousands of times do you not hear that "You must not do this; you are interfering with my business"!

There we have it, bluntly spoken in plain terms. Work for the public welfare interferes with business. It is the cry of San Francisco confronted by the plague. It is the cry of the purveyors of rotten foodstuffs threatened with the Pure Food Law. It is the cry of the concocters of harmful or worthless nostrums contemplating the enlightenment of the people. Behind those Senators and Representatives so fearful of unduly magnifying the importance of the Nation's health by giving it recognition along with agriculture and war and commerce and labor; behind those high officials so ready to strain existing law and to nullify its protection because it hurts trade; behind those figureheads who bring ridiculous charges against honest officials; behind those loud-mouthed trumpeters of imaginary dangers who try to befog the issue—behind all these skulk strange figures. We glimpse now and then sinister shadows. They are the shadows cast by business—the kind of business that will suffer from efforts for the public good. It will be worth while for the American people to try to identify the substance of these shadows, to push aside the puppets and manikins and to drag the skulkers behind them into the light of day. Then they may decide for themselves whether or not it is well to interfere with the business

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is so strenuous in its opposition but so chary of showing itself in the open, whether or not they are willing to accept it as a satisfactory offset to the lives of their 600,000 fellow-Americans who fill unnecessary graves every year.

A FRIEND ON DECK

BY EDWARD A. STEINER

TRAVELING in the steerage is a habit from which one is easily weaned, especially when the steamship company's agent suggests that there are certain things which can better be studied from the captain's table and the purser's office or the director's desk at the home port.

Inasmuch as the purpose of this journey was a study of the "Care of the Emigrant," and as I know his side of the story fairly well, I took the hint. I studied the problem from the commercial and official view-point as I traveled across the Atlantic and from one port of embarkation to another; but I accepted only such privileges as did not hamper my absolute freedom, and which seemed necessitated by the nature of the inquiry.

This sort of semi-official journey for the purpose of such important investigations had great advantages, for many channels which would have been absolutely closed to me as a steerage passenger were opened. Unfortunately, however, they often bore the evidences of having been dug for the occasion—at least the aforesaid channels were sometimes suspiciously clean and the time of my visitation timed rather too accurately. Having seen all these harbors and transfer stations, as well as the steerage, over and over again—without escort—of course I had no difficulty in detecting the difference between the staging set up for my benefit and that which the emigrant has to face when there are no "distinguished" visitors present. So I could afford to permit the preparations to be made and enjoy hearing the brass band play for me on foreign shores "The Star-Spangled Banner," dine with royal commissioners, and travel in Government yachts.

On the whole, it may be said that the strict enforcement of the laws at Ellis Island immediately manifests itself in Fiume, Triest, Hamburg, and Bremen. Never were emigrants so closely scrutinized as they are now, and never were so many refused permission to take passage to the United States. From three to five physicians examine every traveler from the time he leaves his home until he reaches his steerage quarters, and so searching a physical test was never applied to him even when he was being drafted into the army. Not even the most radical restrictionist could subject the emigrant to a severer scrutiny than that which is now exercised.

After seeing over one hundred thousand steerage passengers, one could not help believing that the despair of the Royal Commissioner of Emigration of Hungary was genuine when he threw up his hands and cried, "You are robbing us of the flower of our manhood and womanhood!" The fact that one ship whose loading we watched carried sixteen hundred people of whom only three per cent were above the ages of twenty-eight and only two per cent below fourteen proved the truth of his statement.

It is not the aim of this article to point out the many wrongs still practiced against the emigrant, nor to call attention to the admirable care taken of him at such ports as Hamburg and Triest; but to point out one unused opportunity to prepare him properly for his ordeal at Ellis Island, to instruct him as to the advantages awaiting him outside our cities, and to help disentangle his confusion of mind and soul as he faces the unknown country.

The privilege of making such a test was granted me through the courtesy of the Hamburg-American Line, which gave me permission to use its steerage as a laboratory, while its officers aided me in my task in every possible way. My face was familiar to nearly all the steerage passengers, for before embarkation they had seen me standing beside the examining physicians, and, later, on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the gangplank as they boarded the ship; and in each case I asked them many personal questions.

My official position was emphasized by the fact that I made the rounds of the ship with the captain each day, and that I was treated by officers and seamen with marked respect. This, instead of making my approach to the steerage passengers more difficult, as I feared it might, had the opposite effect. I discovered that whenever I stopped to talk to an individual I not only received courteous replies, but that he was glad, even proud, to be spoken to by a man with authority. Moreover, the men in his group were eager to be spoken to and came to me with many questions and complaints.

There were eleven hundred steerage passengers: of these six hundred were adult males, and I spoke to every one of them during the ten days of the trip. I learned much of each man's history and was enabled in many cases to tell him something of the new place and country to which he was going, of the immigration laws and their enforcement, the opportunities farther west, the institutions which would aid him, and those he should avoid.

It is characteristic of nearly all steerage passengers that they try to fortify themselves against the officials at Ellis Island by all sorts of lies which they think will enable them to enter the country. For instance, a Turkish Jew had the idea that he would be more likely to be admitted if he said that he was a Turk rather than a Jew. When I inquired about his religion, he replied, "I am a Turk." Then I asked him how many wives he had. He stopped as if to count, and said, "Seven." When I told him that seven wives were six too many and that no polygamists are admitted to the United States, he readily admitted, what I already knew, that he was a son of Abraham rather than of Ishmael.

A boy of sixteen, who was going to his uncle, a baker, had been warned not to come into conflict with the contract labor law, and insisted that he had no friends nor job awaiting him.

A young girl of twenty told me that, through correspondence, she had arranged with a young man whom she did not know to claim her as his cousin. She hoped to find such favor in his eyes that he would marry her.

A man of fifty who had nearly a thousand dollars told me he had but fifty, fearing that he would be taxed if it were known how much money he was bringing.

In all cases I insisted that the best way to placate Uncle Sam was to tell the truth, and that nothing was to be gained by lying.

I was also able to straighten out many curious and incomplete addresses which would have delayed the immigrants in reaching their friends, or made it wholly impossible. For instance, one youth was going to his brother at Pleece Kal, R. F. No. 3715 LoranO. I do not know that he would ever have reached his destination: *Please call*, Rural Free Delivery 3715, Lorain, Ohio. It is certain that he would have been long detained at Ellis Island before the mysterious address could have been deciphered.

One of the most serious problems of the steerage is that of the relation of the sexes, and I could warn young women, reprimand the men, and tell all of them something of the moral ideals in our social life.

There were many opportunities to explain the nature of our government, the laws of citizenship, and the chances for an education. But that which seemed the simplest and at the same time the most important service I rendered was to tell those who were going into the interior of our country the best route to take, how to prepare themselves for the journey, and what were the values of our money.

Never before had I established such vital contact with my fellow-passengers as on this trip, when I was related to them in an official capacity; or, to state it more correctly, when I was a self-appointed official friend.

Unfortunately, the cabin passengers were landed on Sunday morning and the steerage passengers had to wait until Monday afternoon. I promised all of them that I would meet them at Ellis Island, and they looked forward to the landing with at least a little less fear.

On Monday afternoon I found them packed in the barges which brought them to the island, and when they saw that I had kept my word they cheered me and greeted me as I wanted to be greeted—as a friend.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Williams, the Commissioner of Immigration, I was permitted to supervise the examination of my friends and bring to the attention of the inspectors those who needed to be looked after first, that they might catch their trains. I was also authorized to insist upon the exchange of such railway tickets as seemed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to take them over a circuitous route. I also attended the hearings of those who were detained, and gave important testimony. When the last passenger left Ellis Island, I felt that I had really been of service to over eleven hundred people, and that I should like best to travel again as a *friend* on the ship.

They had crossed the ocean, their rights protected, their problems explained, and their fears dispelled by a *friend*. They were examined and admitted to the United States under the auspices of a *friend;* and the question arises, Why should not every ship have a friend on board who could give his whole time to this most important task?

With every ship which carries passengers from its home ports the Italian Government insists upon sending a royal commissioner who looks after the rights of his fellow-countrymen; at least, he is supposed to guard their rights. With scarcely any exceptions, however, these men are bureaucrats of the worst sort, who play and smoke with the first-class passengers and let their countrymen shift for themselves. In nearly every dispute brought to my attention they have taken the side of the steamship company.

In other ports it is one of the customs of the steamship company to serve its finest wines and best cigars to those officials who come to examine the conditions under which their people travel. In one case the royal commissioner was under the influence of liquor, or, rather, plain drunk, while the ship on which his charges were being driven was filthy, overrun by vermin, and short of many of its crew on account of desertion. Our United States consuls at the ports I have investigated, with very rare exceptions, are either ignorant of existing conditions, seemingly without authority, or, as in one case, stupidly careless, for when I reported to this man the condition in which I found the steerage he replied: "Oh, well, they are not traveling *de luxe*." Now, why should not the United States provide an official *friend* who would do what I tried to do? A law to this effect could easily be passed: the problem, of course, would be to find the men.

The following qualifications are not so rare but that the men ought to be found: A speaking knowledge of three languages, an acquaintance with the environment under which the immigrant has to live, unimpeachable character, and, above everything else, a knowledge of men, the ability to distinguish quickly between the truth and a lie, and a keen sympathy—which last is something more than merely having a good heart. There are many criticisms of this plan which rise in my own mind even as I suggest it. First, whether our United States commissioner, or whatever he was called, would not be corrupted by the good cigars and wines of the steamship company and the alluring society in the first cabin. To a degree this could be guarded against by giving him a decent room on the steerage side of the ship, with the privilege of taking his meals in the second cabin. He would have many more interested and important people watching his work and behavior than the Italian commissioner has, from the very fact that the passengers in the cabins are largely Americans.

The one thing which cannot well be guarded against is that he, too, might become bureaucratic, and so defeat the very object of his office. He needs to be the friend of a rather unattractive group of people, and for that reason it would be better if the office could be filled by some of those young idealists in whom religion has awakened the love of humanity regardless of the class in which it travels through life.

That such a friend is needed by the steerage passengers is self-evident, and I have tried to prove by my experiment that the immigrant will make use of such an officer.

I wish I might be able to impress Congress with the fact that such an officer would serve his country as well as the immigrant, and impress upon it the necessity of creating such an office. Then I should like to prove to the self-sacrificing, idealistic youths of this country that they ought to apply for the job, because it is a job worth while. I confess that I am confident that Congress would have less difficulty in getting the officers than in creating the office.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPECTATOR

THE 9th of November is an important day in the civic life of London, and a delight to all "ye lovers" of pageantry. The Spectator is one of those simple people who, childishly perhaps, still thrills at the sight of marching soldiers and follows the column just for the enjoyment of keeping step to the military music. But when to these delights are added a real gilded coach, six gayly caparisoned horses, and a live postilion with a cracking whip, the Spectator feels his heart beat like any boy's, and he claps his hands in excitement. In fact, he is forgetting all about sequence and co-ordination and all such literary truths in his eagerness to take the reader into the very midst of the fun. For the 9th of November is Lord Mayor's Day in London, and is gladdened by the one old pageant still preserved in the life of the city. On that morning, with trumpet and drum and "youthful jollity," the change of Lord Mayors is celebrated. Dick Whittington, heralded by clanging Bow bells, thrice held this honored post, but since his rule London has had a new Lord Mayor every year with the regularity of Greenwich clock-work. The Spectator was fortunate enough to have a ticket for the balcony of the Mansion House, where the municipal head of the capital has his official and private residence.

The procession starts from the Guildhall, where the flock of pigeons cooingly echo Venice and its Piazza di San Marco. Down Princess Street it passes and makes a sweeping turn just below the balcony of the Mansion House. The setting for the pageant is unique. Opposite looms the Bank of England, a very rock of gold and mountain of bank-notes on which largely rests the prosperity of Great Britain. On one side is the Royal Exchange with its Corinthian portico, while across the way is the Mansion House, whence issue the laws that govern the city of London. In the triangular space between these symbols of England's greatness converges the traffic of the capital. A stream as unending as life itself meets and passes here, while the affairs of the world are influenced by the decisions reached within those three buildings. As the time approaches for the passing of the procession the streets are cleared of vehicles. The subdued roar of a crowd succeeds the noise of the suspended traffic as swaying ranks of people cover the pavements. Children are everywhere, clinging to their mothers' skirts and perched on the shoulders of their fathers. Here was a show free to all, and the thrifty British souls made the most of such an opportunity. The Duke of Wellington on horseback, in marble immobility, dominated the throng, which seemed to be patient, happy, and good-humored, like every typical English crowd.

A mist clouded the scene, uncertain whether to melt into the crisp air or remain, veiling everything in a white shroud. The effect was Rembrandtesque, but dampening to ardor. Yet the time of waiting soon passed, for the Spectator became absorbed anew in the skill and efficiency of the London "bobbies." They managed the mass of conflicting wills as absolutely as though the crowd had formed one body. They were so genial and jolly, too, that the dislike of the proletariat to those in authority could not exist in the kindly atmosphere of protection which the English policemen diffuse.

Such deductions were cut short, for on a sudden around the corner swung a gilded coach. It was a hundred and fifty years old, yet still gorgeous, and a very fat and pompous coachman in wig and three-cornered hat drove the six horses, while a jaunty postilion rode one of the leaders and cracked his whip to the gaping crowd. It was a regular Cinderella equipage, straight from the realm of fairyland. But, alas! no fair Cinderella alighted from the coach as it came to a swaying standstill in front of the Mansion House. It was quite empty. There it stood and waited for the Lord Mayor, who, preceded by lackeys, soon appeared, descended the stairs to the ringing cheers of the throng, and entered the picturesque coach. Away they went to the Guildhall, there to join the procession, while the City Marshal in scarlet rode bravely ahead to clear the road.

An hour ticked itself away, enlivened by galloping buglers, wearing peaked velvet caps and gilded coats, or trotting troops of cavalry, all hastening to the Guildhall. The increased activity of the police and the squad of ambulance assistants finally assured the Spectator and his *confrères* that the procession itself was on the way. At last it came into sight, and the effect was superb. Soldiers and civilians, sailors and aldermen, followed in such quick succession that the order is rather vague in the mind of the Spectator, confused by the flash of colors and the stirring music of the brass bands. He remembers a huge lifeboat manned by "jolly Jack tars" and an ancient press with its grinning "printer's devil." There were gay banners and fluttering flags carried by various guilds and military or naval schools; there was the usual number of red coats and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bear-skin helmets, and some uniforms of Nattier blue. Solemn mace-bearers and gilded coaches with lackeys clinging on behind and grim sheriffs inside all passed by under the light of the sun, which had finally consented to smile on the pageant. But best of all was the group of literary and historical personages mounted on fractious steeds which their riders managed gingerly or recklessly, to the amusement of the crowd. William Shakespeare won the most applause. He was dressed in black velvet, and was followed by personifications of his plays, also mounted and very debonair. Many jeering sallies greeted "Bottom" with his ass's head. Little Comus, riding in the train of Milton, was very popular. Monarchs and princes figured in the procession, too; Julius Cæsar, laurel-crowned, sitting in his chariot, and little Prince Arthur on his pony, both excited exclamations. The first caused murmurs of wonder, the second of pity. Tragic death coming to a man rarely arouses the universal sympathy which the same fate causes when a child is the victim.

And on streamed the gala procession with its picturesque pageantry and military bands until it had vanished in the distance. So thrilled was the Spectator in these pages from the past that he forgot all about the present until a cup of steaming coffee was offered him in the Egyptian Hall of the Mansion House. Then he realized how cold it had become.

Curiously enough, on the ninth day of November, London has three Lord Mayors: the outgoing, the incoming, and the acting Lord Mayor. The latter on this occasion proved a pleasant and genial gentleman who offered to show the Spectator over the Mansion House. Into the court where cases are tried, down to the strong room lined with glittering gold and silver plate, through the bustling kitchens where joints were roasting on spits in lavish and old-fashioned style, and up again to the gaudy reception-rooms and quiet council chambers, the Spectator followed his guide. The hospitable Lord Mayor suggested luncheon, which was followed by an invitation to hear him judge some cases in the court-room below. A pickpocket was first tried. He was pale and gaunt, and protested "Not guilty." The judging Lord Mayor, after hearing the evidence, replied: "Three months' hard labor for your innocence, my poor fellow." Oh, that look of hate from the starved eyes of the thief as he turned away from the judge, prosperous, honest, sitting in fur-lined robe and golden chain and pronouncing sentence on the wretch—the one, born to misery and hunger, dragging out a mere existence in the mire of the down-trodden; the other, gifted at birth with opportunities as golden as his chain, all the chances, all the luck leading him onward, till he sits in judgment above the unfortunate. Yet justice is just, though mistakes are made, and this man must go to prison in the name of law, for he was known to the police as a professional pick-pocket; a few months in jail, a deeper impress of the prison stamp, release for a while, the wretch grown more hardened and brazen, and then a repetition of just such a scene in the Mansion House court-room; and thus is writ, in letters of shame, the life of a man.

Such meditations depressed the Spectator as he listened abstractedly to a few more cases, and the judge, by that curious telepathy of the mind, read his thoughts. So that later, walking back through the maze of apartments, he told a tale, and it was this. Riding one day in the tube, this gentleman asked a man sitting beside him what his paper said of a recent disaster at sea. Instead of replying, the man looked keenly at his interlocutor and asked a counter-question. Had he not sat on the bench three years before? Answering in the affirmative, the gentleman waited for further explanation. The stranger's face lighted up wonderfully as he replied: "I owe you an endless debt of gratitude, sir; you sent me to prison then, and it made me an honest man. I remember your face well, and can never forget that kindness you did me. Your act made me realize the meaning of justice and of right. You brought me up with a good round turn, and shame did the rest." Saying which a trifle brokenly, the unknown man jumped from the train and disappeared in the crowd. "But the glow in my heart, Mr. Spectator, remains to this day whenever I think of the gratitude of that stranger. And when the sight of so much crime and misfortune makes me wonder what the justice of it can be, I think of that unknown man."

"'Never dreamed though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,'" murmured the Spectator as he shook hands with his host.

"'Held, we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,'" finished the kindly Lord Mayor, cordially returning the pressure.

And as the Spectator walked away he thought doubtingly of the story of the alderman who asked with scorn, "Palladio, who was he—was he a freeman of the city?" and thereupon rejected the great architect's design for the Mansion House because forsooth he was only an Italian. That official's ignorance was difficult to believe after such an interview with the gentleman who quoted Browning with the same ease that he formulated a philosophy of his own, and who, in spite of it all, was an alderman himself a year before. Education truly has done wonders even with the men in high office.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW BOOKS

Your United States. By Arnold Bennett. Harper & Brothers, New York. $2.

If one may judge by comments heard and extracts printed, no magazine articles of the year have been more widely read than those in which Mr. Arnold Bennett presented his impressions of a first visit to this country. Americans are thought to be somewhat sensitive to comments of foreign visitors, and the reason is found in the fact that too many books of this kind have generalized so sweepingly, often after very superficial observation. Mr. Bennett disarms criticism of this kind because he shows so plainly that what he has to record is exactly what he calls it—impressions. Here, as always, he visualizes for the reader most distinctly and sharply those things which did, in fact, interest him in a limited but active survey of certain things in American life. He will be the first to admit that things not seen by him might be seen by others which would modify the notes and comments he makes. It is his great merit that he does not pretend to be exhaustive or exact or to throw into full perspective the separate things talked about. The book certainly makes agreeable and often suggestive reading.

Wanderer in Florence (A). By E. V. Lucas. The Macmillan Company, New York. $1.75.

Most people know that Mr. Lucas is not only humorist, essayist, and novelist, but also art critic and art lover. When his wanderings took him to Florence, he naturally found in that greatest of art centers abundant material in architecture, sculpture, and painting for description, comparison, and criticism of an informal but discriminating kind. He has covered the ground thoroughly and in a way all his own. We cordially and unhesitatingly commend the volume both to those who know Florence already and to those who mean to visit it and who want something different from the ordinary handbook. The publishers have illustrated the work fully and with discretion.

Spirit of French Literature (The). By Mabell S. C. Smith. The Macmillan Company, New York. $1.50.

Mrs. Smith's little book on Dickens may have prepared her readers somewhat for the larger study contained in the present volume—a survey of French literature with special attention to the political and economical conditions of the particular period which produced that literature. For instance, let us consider the realism of the nineteenth century. Renan was one of its exponents. Mrs. Smith says of him in part:

> Moralist, philosopher, philologist, historian, scientist, Renan brought a powerful mind to bear on a multiplicity of themes which he developed individually and then interwove in support of his great work on religion. . . .
>
> Renan's own nature was gentle and sincere; he was not a vulgarian who wrote for the pleasure of shocking; he was an earnest supporter of freedom of belief and of the application of scientific laws to the facts that lie behind theology. His work, nevertheless, forwarded a skeptical reaction against the religious impulse set in motion by Chateaubriand.
>
> It is in Renan's literary output that we are concerned, however, for he stands forth as a prince of realists. The photographic instinct was strong in him, yet he knew how to subordinate the unimportant, to select the vital and to develop everything with the accuracy of the scientist and the taste of the artist. His main work is that of the thinker and the scholar, but he delights also in sketches and "memories" which are delicately executed drawings. . . .

And then follows the well-known sketch of Nazareth in Renan's "Life of Jesus." In like manner Mrs. Smith supplements her own comment—compact and keen—by extracts from each author's work, these extracts reflecting, of course, not only the times in which the author lived, but also his own individual spirit and workmanship. The book is helpful and very suggestive. A corresponding volume on German literature would be equally interesting.

Lighter Side of Irish Life (The). By George A. Birmingham. The F. A. Stokes Company, New York. $1.75.

The author had already shown in his "Spanish Gold" and other stories of Irish life that one may write with humor about Ireland without following the stale, conventional lines of the comic Irishman of drama and fiction. Mr. Bernard Shaw has pointed out in his prologue to the Irish play called "John Bull's Other Island" that some of these conventional ideas are not only erroneous but topsy-turvy, and Mr. Birmingham enforces this theory without following Shaw in his extreme and paradoxical assertions. What is best of all is that the author has given us here a thoroughly readable book in which the anecdotes are novel and come in naturally to illustrate the meaning. There are sixteen color illustrations of rather widely varying merit by Mr. Henry W. Kerr.

Cease Firing. By Mary Johnston. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. $1.40.

Miss Johnston's new story is in effect a continuation of her earlier and moving tale of the war between the States, "The Long Roll." It takes up the narrative after Chancellorsville, describes the campaign in the Mississippi Valley, the fights in Tennessee and West Virginia, the final struggles in the Wilderness, and Sherman's march to the sea. A tender and pathetic love story runs through the book and issues victoriously, for victorious love sometimes ends not in marriage but in death. This book, like its predecessor, shows an enormous amount of patient work, of familiarity with detail which must have been won at great expense of time and toil. It is not, strictly speaking, a novel; it is rather a dramatization of a great struggle. Like Tolstoy's "War and Peace," it is the history of a great movement in human affairs. There are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times when the action seems to be impeded by its range, but there is no time when the interest and vital imagination of the novelist falters or grows faint. "Cease Firing" is the work of a very able woman who feels deeply but who is never a partisan; who, in two striking stories, has told the story of the war from the Southern point of view with ardor, passionate loyalty, and devotion, but without rancor or injustice to the opposing forces. It might be added in passing that the peace societies have no literature in their possession comparable with this book as an indictment of war.

Strong Hand (The). By Warwick Deeping. The Cassell Company, New York. $1.35.

A story of English country-town life, with a strong character in the person of the young doctor who fights dirt, ignorance, and selfishness in a place the evil conditions of which invite the epidemic of disease that comes to give the book its critical situation. Readers of Charles Kingsley's "Two Years Ago" will be interested in seeing how differently what is practically the same story-idea can be treated by two authors. In certain ways this seems to us the best novel Mr. Deeping has written recently.

Best of a Bad Job (The). By Norman Duncan. The Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. $1.

Norman Duncan has not written too much of the Labrador region, as is amply proved by the power of his latest story. Old Tom Tulk had to *learn* to make the best of a bad job, and he learned so well that he left a moral to every man on the coast. A tale of sheer courage touched by such tender pathos is not often found. "As for me," says Tom Tulk, "my friend is Laughter from Get-Along-Somehow, an' my best bedfellow is called Grit." With this he won back his courage and left his legacy to the men of the north seas.

Ordeal (The). By Charles Egbert Craddock. The J. B. Lippincott Company, New York. $1.60.

The Tennessee Mountains once more are the background of a romance by Charles Egbert Craddock. No beautiful mountain girl is involved, but moonshiners and a revenue officer furnish occasion for a murder and abduction, both falling upon innocent victims. The romance is strained and quite unconvincing, while the plot is far from strong. "The Ordeal" is not equal either in its form or originality to the early novels from the same pen.

World We Live In (The). By George Stuart Fullerton. The Macmillan Company, New York. $1.50.

In this vigorously written volume Dr. Fullerton, Professor of Philosophy in Columbia University, assails the idealist philosophy, and particularly its Berkeleian type, as false to the reality of things. Its world is not "everybody's world," the world of practical common sense. Obviously it is quite different. But this hardly justifies denial of an identity of the two at bottom, or accusation of the idealist, who practically treats everybody's world as real, of indulging himself, while alternating between the study and the street, in a sort of "Jekyll-Hyde experience." But Professor Fullerton insists that "the Absolute is no better than a word," and regards all soaring of thought above the physical world as illegitimate transcendentalism. Professor Royce's "new idealism" fares no better at his hands than Berkeley's; "the world as idea" is to him "a phantom world," unreal. Professor Fullerton fails to note that, while all that exists—even a dream—is, in a sense, real while it exists, only that which never ceases to exist can be real in the highest and ultimate meaning of the word. Everybody's world, though real while it lasts, is phenomenal and transitory. The everlasting Power behind it all, its very ground of being—this surely is the eternal reality. We cannot, then, with Professor Fullerton, abjure all "talk of a far-off divine event," etc., or confine philosophy to existing things—things which do not ultimately persist in being.

Belgium: The Land of Art. By William Elliot Griffis. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. $1.25.

To his long list of helpful books Dr. Griffis now adds "Belgium." The book has a sub-title, "The Land of Art." It is true that Belgium is one of the lands of art, although the title is more emphatically in mind as applied to some other lands. But, being true to a great extent with regard to Belgium, one looks in a book with over three hundred pages with such a sub-title for more than a comparatively few lines on Rubens and van Dyck. If the text is not to be enlarged in future editions of the book, the sub-title might well be omitted; as it is, it is misleading. Nor let the intending reader expect to be instructed about Belgian literature any more than he is instructed concerning Belgian art. Concerning present commercial and political conditions, however, despite one or two statements on which all are not agreed, the volume is very informative. As a history of Belgium it is clear, vivid, and well written. It should be in the hands of every visitor to one of the most interesting small countries in Europe.

Outline of the History of Christian Thought since Kant (An). By Edward Caldwell Moore, Professor of Theology in Harvard University. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 75c.

One can scarcely speak too highly of this illuminating review of a period coeval with that of our National independence, and characterized by a ferment and change in the world of thought as that has been in the world of action. During this period the new spirit that awoke in the Protestant Reformation has entered regions which, in lack of the necessary regulatives, it then failed to penetrate. These have been developed in the intellectual advance that began

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Kant: namely, the conduct of historical and literary criticism in scientific method; the scientific conception of nature and man's relation to nature; the idealist construction of the universe on the foundation laid by Kant. These have led to a reformation of thought concerning Christianity, the history of which Professor Moore has sketched in clear and striking outlines. He introduces it by a historico-critical survey of the entire movement, its factors and stages, with its changeful background of deism, rationalism, pietism, and æsthetic idealism. Its distinct lines are then traced in their details—idealistic philosophy, theological reconstruction, the critical historical movement, the contribution of the sciences, the English-speaking peoples—action and reaction. In each of these lines the contributory work of the great leaders is critically reviewed. The entire presentation is characterized by a masterly grasp and appraisal both of the whole movement and of its several particulars—a momentous movement still in progress on "the great and sure foundation" that has been laid. It is conceivable, says Professor Moore, that this century may witness changes as noteworthy as those of the last.

Through the Heart of Africa. By Frank H. Melland and Edward H. Cholmeley. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. $4.

Cycling through Africa has a venturesome sound, and the description of it by Mr. Melland and Mr. Cholmeley, while apparently making light of some of the hardships and dangers, only brings out more clearly and vividly the features of African life which certainly differentiate it from that of more civilized continents. The present volume is well worth reading throughout; it is the "latest word" regarding a large part of Africa.

Mornings with Masters of Art. By H. H. Powers, Ph.D. The Macmillan Company, New York. $2.

To the number of books on art, and especially on painting, must be added Dr. Powers's. His is a comprehensive volume, for he ranges from such subjects as "The Afterglow of Greece," "How Art Became Christian," to discussions of Ghiberti and Donatello, Leonardo and Michelangelo. The book, however, is not as comprehensive as its title would indicate. It deals chiefly with Florentine art. It is a suggestive and helpful volume.

Fanny Burney at the Court of Queen Charlotte. By Constance Hill. The John Lane Company, New York. $5.

Before opening this book one is inclined to ask why there is need of any better or other Fanny Burney story than her own diary and letters and the Macaulay essay, but one finds the answer in reading this volume, which, like two predecessors relating also to Madame d'Arblay, put the lively story of this most interesting figure of Court and literary life in the eighteenth century in modern form and with judicious selection and omission. Miss Hill has an enviably happy knack at this kind of thing, and it has never been better shown than in this book.

How to Get Your Pay Raised. By Nathaniel C. Fowler, Jr. A. C. McClurg Company, Chicago. $1.

This is one of the series of practical books in which Mr. Fowler collects the suggestions of many successful men to young people about to begin business life. Here there are such suggestions from over fifty business men, bankers, teachers, and others, and these are supplemented by the author's own tersely written chapters. The shortest recommendations we have noted are those of a civil engineer who says: "Remember, Always to do something, Keep doing something, And always do that something well."

International Bible Dictionary. By Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D. The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia. $2.40.

There are many good points in this comparatively low-priced and well-illustrated volume. The announcement of its publishers that it conforms to "the latest discoveries and conclusions of modern scholarship" is but partly sustained by its contents. *E.g.*, its editor regards both the book of Daniel and the book of Jonah as historical, and the Fourth Gospel and the Revelation as both written by the Apostle John. No intimation is given that the Genesis story of Adam is not historical: "Adam was created (not born) a perfect man in body and spirit, but as innocent and completely inexperienced as a babe." Of miracle this notion is held: "It is simply a personal God putting his will into the laws of nature"—as if it were not in them continuously. Discussion of the miraculous and supernatural—terms usually confounded in popular thought—has advanced beyond this notion of divine interferences and interpositions.

Latin Works and the Correspondence of Huldreich Zwingli. Translated by Henry Preble, Walter Lichtenstein, and Lawrence A. McLouth. Vol. I. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $2.

The edition of Zwingli's works in use since 1828 is now succeeded by another, the fourth, improving much upon the former edition in every point. Begun in 1903, and still incomplete, the new edition is to be made accessible to English readers in a series of volumes. The first of these is the last work of its scholarly editor, Dr. Samuel Macaulay Jackson, finished just before his lamented death last summer. Most of its contents now appear for the first time in English, miscellaneous in kind, historical, political, and religious—interesting throughout. Zwingli's progressive spirit, humanistic, independent, and open-minded, commend him to us as more modern than any of his fellow-reformers. More in advance of his time than they, he deserves to have been equally well known with any of them, but is gradually coming to his own.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BY THE WAY

The Treasury, it is announced, is at work on new designs for our paper money. The new plans provide for bills of a smaller size and with uniform designs for all bills of the same denomination. Thus, all one-dollar bills will bear the head of Washington, all five-dollar bills the portrait of Lincoln, etc.

To the deadly fly is now attributed another disease—that of infantile paralysis. The Harvard medical faculty announces, as a result of its investigations, that the common stable fly distributes the germs of this disease. Common flies, apparently harmless, are now known to be the carriers of typhoid fever, of the sleeping sickness, of ophthalmia, and of infantile paralysis, and are thus among the worst enemies of the human race.

"Blue sky laws," as discussed at the recent convention of the Investment Bankers' Association, do not, as might be supposed, refer to the height of buildings on city streets, but are aimed to prevent the selling of fraudulent securities. The name is derived from the idea that makers of these securities would capitalize the heavens themselves. "Blue sky" legislation is, it is said, on foot in several States other than Kansas, which already has such a law.

Appropriately enough, the home of an Anti-Window Steaming Company is London, England. The fogging of windows is doubtless a serious trouble to shopkeepers in that city, and the company prevents this by a simple device which blows a current of dry air on the glass. A window which had been steamed to opaqueness is said to have been cleared perfectly within thirty seconds by the new apparatus.

The priceless privilege of European travel, once secured, is often undervalued by Americans. "Lippincott's" tells of two American girls talking together in Paris: "What shall we do this afternoon?" "Let's go to the Louvre." "Oh, no; I've been there already, and it's not the sort of place you care to go to more than once." The Magasin du Louvre would doubtless have been better appreciated by this young woman.

Tecumseh, the famous Indian chief, did not lose his standing among his own people because of his disastrous defeat at Tippecanoe. In the "American Historical Review" an interesting "journal" of the War of 1812 is published which contains this reference to the chief: "I have seen the great Tecumseh. He is a very plane man, rather above middle size, a noble set of features and an admirable eye. He is always accompanied by Six great chiefs, who never go before him."

There are several fashionable auction rooms in New York City which attract people of means who are fond of "bargains." At a recent sale at one of these places an arm-chair brought $315, and a three-piece suite, consisting of a sofa and two side chairs, $1,900. These articles were of carved walnut, covered with fine old figured tapestry, but neither historic nor personal associations entered into their value, as described in the auctioneer's catalogue.

A novelty in the way of a text-book for teaching English to foreign laborers is, it is stated, to be used by the Chicago Young Men's Christian Association. It will be called "Safety First for Foreigners," and each lesson will consist of a picture of an accident and information in simple words as to the best way of avoiding it. It is hoped in this way to reduce the large number of accidents to foreigners in Chicago.

The always original F. Hopkinson Smith, artist and author, has found a new way of sketching the London streets. He does it from a taxicab, which he declares to be the best way. "It rains about every five minutes in London," Mr. Smith is reported as saying, "and when I came to a place where I wished to work I'd just lower the front hood, sit up on the seat, and look out over the heads of the people." The artist has been sketching places made famous by Thackeray or Dickens.

The quantity of material excavated at Panama, according to illustrations in the "Scientific American," would make 63 Great Pyramids, or would build a Chinese Wall 1,000 miles longer than the original wall so called. As the Chinese Wall, however, was faced with granite, paved with bricks, and flanked with towers for at least 1,500 miles, it is a question whether it did not require a greater expenditure of labor than the Canal.

Dr. W. E. Geil, who in 1908 journeyed from end to end of the Chinese Wall, says that with its extensions its total length is really 2,550 miles, and that originally 40,000 stone towers guarded it. His book, "The Great Wall of China," contains photographs showing the Wall crossing rugged mountains 4,000 feet high.

Mrs. Hetty Green, known as the richest woman in America, disclaims a newspaper interview published on her seventy-seventh birthday which tried to make it appear that she is also one of the wisest women in America. Among the aphorisms attributed to her was this: "Don't overdress—that is, don't dress flashily." Mrs. Green might well have indorsed this particular sentiment, for her characteristic attire is described as consisting of "a rusty black suit and a black straw hat."

A new society called the "Spugs" has for its object the "elimination through co-operative effort of the custom of giving indiscriminately at Christmas" *and* "the furthering in every way of the true Christmas spirit." The association's popular name is derived from the initials of its formal title, the Society for the Prevention of Useless Giving.

Children are often fearful of the water, especially at the seashore, and kind-hearted parents will not thrust a terror-stricken baby into the surf. John Muir in the "Atlantic Monthly" emphasizes the need of caution in this matter by relating how he was made miserable as a child by being plunged again and again into the sea by a strong-armed servant, despite his shrieks. "As the time approached for this terrible bathing," he says, "I used to hide in the darkest corners of the house, and oftentimes a long search was required to find me."

Lord Dufferin, according to an exchange, once addressed a Canadian university audience in Greek. The papers complimented him on his Greek as idiomatically perfect. "How did the reporters know that?" a friend asked Sir John Macdonald, who had heard the address. "Because I told them," replied Sir John. "But who told you? You don't know Greek," persisted the friend. "I don't know Greek," the Premier admitted, with a twinkle, "but I know politics."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED